00111096

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
Royal Asiatic Society.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 03 December, 2015

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

JOHN DAVID MICHAELIS,

LATE PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GOTTINGEN, &c.

111096

TRANSLATED FROM

THE FOURTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN,

AND

CONSIDERABLY AUGMENTED WITH NOTES,

AND A

DISSERTATION

ON THE ORIGIN AND COMPOSITION

OF THE

THREE FIRST GOSPELS.

BY

HERBERT MARSH, B.D. F.R.S.

FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

VOL. IV.

THE SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

Printed by Luke Hansard,

FOR F. AND C. RIVINGTON, N°. 62, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

1802.

00111096

CONTENTS.

VOL. IV.

CHAPTER X.

OF THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL IN GENERAL.

SECT. I.—*Of the order in which St. Paul's Epiſtles are placed in the New Teſtament* - - - - - Page 1

SECT. II.—*St. Paul dictated his Epiſtles, and wrote a greater number than thoſe which are now extant* - 3

CHAP. XI.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

SECT. I.—*The Epiſtle to the Galatians is, among thoſe which are now extant, the firſt which St. Paul wrote* 8

SECT. II.—*Of the Galatian Chriſtians, and their ſeducers* 14

CHAP. XII.

OF THE TWO EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

SECT. I.—*Of the time when St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians* - - - - - - - - - - 23

SECT. II.—*Of the circumſtances of the Church at Theſſalonica* - - - - - - - - - - - 26

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

OF THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

SECT. I.—*Of the perſon and character of Titus* Page 29

SECT. II.—*When and where the Epiſtle to Titus was written* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 31

SECT. III.—*Of the Jews in Crete* - - - - - - 40

CHAP. XIV.

OF THE TWO EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

SECT. I.—*Of the city of Corinth: and when, and to whom St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians* - 42

SECT. II.—*The ſtate of the Chriſtian community at Corinth deſcribed* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 44

SECT. III.—*Of the Epiſtle of the Corinthians to St. Paul* 62

SECT. IV.—*Contents of the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians* 68

SECT. V.—*Of the effects of this Epiſtle on the Corinthians* 70

SECT. VI.—*Of the ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians* - 73

SECT. VII.—*Contents of the ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 74

CHAP. XV.

OF THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

SECT. I.—*Of the time when St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to Timothy* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 75

SECT.

SECT. II.—*General remarks on the ſect of the Eſſenes, who had already inculcated their doctrines at Epheſus, when Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to Timothy* - - Page 79

SECT. III.—*Of the principal doctrines and cuſtoms of the Eſſenes, againſt whom St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to Timothy, as alſo thoſe to the Epheſians and Coloſſians* 82

SECT. IV.—*Of the more immediate cauſe of the propagation of the Eſſene errors at Epheſus* - - - - - - - 85

CHAP. XVI.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

SECT. I.—*Of the date and occaſion of this Epiſtle: and of Tertius, who acted as St. Paul's amanuenſis in the committing of it to writing* - - - - - - - - - 89

SECT. II.—*Of the foundation of the church at Rome, and its firſt teachers* - - - - - - - - - - 91

SECT. III.—*Of the falſe notions, which ſome of the Jews entertained concerning Juſtification* - - - - - - 93

SECT. IV.—*Of the notions entertained by the Jews, concerning Election* - - - - - - - - - - - 97

SECT. V.—*Of the ſentiments of the Jews, concerning obedience to the Roman Emperor* - - - - - - - 99

SECT. VI.—*Contents of the Epiſtle to the Romans* - - 102

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

GENERAL REMARKS ON SOME OF THE EPISTLES WRITTEN BY ST. PAUL DURING HIS IMPRISONMENT IN ROME; AND ON THE IMPRISONMENT ITSELF.

SECT. I.—*The Epiſtles to the Epheſians, Coloſſians, and Philemon, were written by St. Paul, while he was priſoner in Rome, and were diſpatched at the ſame time* Page 107

SECT. II.—*Examination of the queſtion, whether St. Paul was twice priſoner in Rome: and if he was, in which of the two impriſonments theſe Epiſtles were written* - 110

CHAP. XVIII.

OF THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON - - - - - - 115

CHAP. XIX.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

SECT. I.—*Of the ſituation of Coloſſæ, and the circumſtances of the Chriſtian community in that city* - - - 116

SECT. II.—*Contents, deſign, and occaſion, of the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians* - - - - - - - - - - - - 120

SECT. III.—*Of the Epiſtle for which St. Paul deſires the Coloſſians*, ch. iv. 16, *to ſend from Laodicea* - 124

CHAP. XX.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

SECT. I.—*Examination of the queſtion whether the Epiſtle, which is called the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, was really addreſſed to the Epheſians* - - - - - - - - 128

SECT.

SECT. II.—*Whether this Epiſtle was an Epiſtle to the Laodiceans* - - - - - - - - - - - Page 134

SECT. III.—*It was probably confined to no Chriſtian community in particular: but was a circular Epiſtle, intended for the uſe of the Epheſians, Laodiceans, and ſome other churches of Aſia Minor* - - - - - - - - 139

SECT. IV.—*Continuation of this Subject* - - - 142

SECT. V.—*Of the ſituation of the Chriſtian community at Epheſus; and the contents and ſtyle of the circular Epiſtle, which they received from St. Paul* - - - - - 146

CHAP. XXI.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

SECT. I.—*Of the city Philippi, and the ſtate of the Chriſtian community there* - - - - - - - - - - 152

SECT. II.—*St. Paul wrote the Epiſtle to the Philippians during his firſt impriſonment in Rome, at the time when he expected to be ſoon releaſed: and perhaps about the beginning of the year* 65 - - - - - - - - - - 157

CHAP. XXII.

OF THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

SECT. I.—*Of the place where Timothy was when St. Paul wrote to him his ſecond Epiſtle* - - - - - 161

SECT. II.—*Whether this Epiſtle was written, while St. Paul was priſoner for the firſt time in Rome, or during a ſecond impriſonment there* - - - - - - - - 165

SECT. III.—*Contents of this Epiſtle* - - - - - 178

CHAP. XXIII.

OF ST. PAUL'S CHARACTER AND MODE OF LIFE.

SECT. I.—*Whether St. Paul was an Impoſtor, an Enthuſiaſt, or a Meſſenger from Heaven* - - - - - - - 179

SECT. II.—*Of St. Paul's profeſſion, or trade* - - 183

CHAP. XXIV.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

SECT. I.—*General remarks: and ſtatement of the queſtions to be examined in this Chapter* - - - - - - 186

SECT. II.—*Is that which we call the Epiſtle to the Hebrews an Epiſtle, or a Diſſertation? And, if it is an Epiſtle, what is the reaſon that the initiatory formula is wanting* - - - - - - - - - - - - - 187

SECT. III.—*Is the Epiſtle to the Hebrews quoted* 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 190

SECT. IV.—*The Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written for the uſe of the Chriſtians in Jeruſalem and Paleſtine* - 193

SECT. V.—*Of the opinion of other writers, on the queſtion, who the Hebrews were, to whom this Epiſtle was ſent* 201

SECT. VI.—*Of the ſituation of the perſons, to whom the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was addreſſed* - - - - - 206

SECT. VII.—*Of the time when, and the place where, this Epiſtle was written* - - - - - - - - - 209

SECT. VIII.—*Of the language, in which it was written* 211

SECT. IX.—*According to the moſt ancient tradition, or opinion, it was written originally in Hebrew* - - 212

SECT.

SECT. X.—*Arguments in favour of the opinion, that this Epiſtle was written in Hebrew* - - - - page 215

SECT. XI.—*A new argument, to prove that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written in Hebrew, derived from the quotations which are made in it from the Old Teſtament* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 221

SECT. XII.—*Confutation of the arguments alleged in favour of the opinion, that it was written in Greek* - - 226

SECT. XIII.—*Examination of the queſtion, whether the Greek Epiſtle to the Hebrews is in all reſpects an accurate tranſlation of the original* - - - - - - - - 234

SECT. XIV.—*Remarks on the Greek ſtyle of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews* - - - - - - - - - - - - - 242

SECT. XV.—*Of the author of this Epiſtle; whether it was written by St. Paul; firſt of the opinion of the ancients on this ſubject* - - - - - - - - - - - 245

SECT. XVI.—*Of the internal marks or characters in the Epiſtle itſelf, from which an inference may be drawn, either in favour of, or againſt the opinion, that St. Paul was the author* - - - - - - - - - - - - 252

SECT. XVII.—*Examination of the opinion entertained by ſome of the ancients, that Barnabas was the author* 258

SECT. XVIII.—*Of the canonical authority of this Epiſtle* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 264

SECT. XIX.—*Of the contents of this Epiſtle* - - 269

CHAP. XXV.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES - 269

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

OF THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES.

SECT. I.—*Previous observations, relative to the James who was called the brother of Jesus* - - - - page 271

SECT. II.—*Whether the author of this Epistle was an Apostle; and if he was, whether he was the elder or the younger Apostle James* - - - - - - - - - 277

SECT. III.—*Whether the author of this Epistle was James, called the brother of Jesus* - - - - - - - 284

SECT. IV.—*Of the persons, to whom this Epistle was written* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 292

SECT. V.—*Of the contents of this Epistle* - - - 296

SECT. VI.—*Whether St. James's doctrine, concerning faith and works, contradicts St. Paul's doctrine of faith without works* - - - - - - - - - - - - 302

SECT. VII.—*Of the time when the Epistle of St. James was written* - - - - - - - - - - - - 306

SECT. VIII.—*Of the canonical authority of this Epistle* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 308

CHAP. XXVII.

OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

SECT. I.—*Of the persons to whom St. Peter addressed this Epistle* - - - - - - - - - - - - - 315

SECT. II.—*Before St. Peter wrote this Epistle, he appears to have read St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* - 323

SECT. III.—*Of the time when this Epistle was written* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 345

SECT. IV.—*Babylon, the place whence St. Peter dates his first Epistle, is either the ancient Babylon on the Euphrates, or Seleucia on the Tigris: but more probably the former* - - - - - - - - - - - page 328

SECT. V.—*Confutation of the arguments alleged in favour of a mystical interpretation of the word Babylon* - 334

SECT. VI.—*Of the contents and design of this Epistle* - 341

SECT. VII.—*Of St. Peter's mode of writing, and the peculiarities of his Greek style* - - - - - - - - 344

CHAP. XXVIII.

OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

SECT. I.—*Of the authenticity of this Epistle* - - 346

SECT. II.—*Of the time when it was written* - - 356

SECT. III.—*Of the design of this Epistle* - - - 367

CHAP. XXIX.

OF THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE.

SECT. I.—*Of the author of this Epistle, whether he was an Apostle, called Jude, or whether he was Jude the brother-in-law of Jesus* - - - - - - - - 363

SECT. II.—*Of the persons to whom, and of the time when, this Epistle was written: and whether the author of it had read the second Epistle of St. Peter* - - - 371

SECT. III.—*Of the canonical authority of this Epistle: and first of the external evidence in its favour* - - 374

SECT. IV.

SECT. IV.—*The ſame queſtion examined from internal evidence* - - - - - - - - - - - - page 378

SECT. V.—*Reſult of the inquiry inſtituted in the preceding ſections; and the queſtion in debate brought to a final iſſue* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 394

CHAP. XXX.

OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN.

SECT. I.—*Of the time when this Epiſtle was written* 395

SECT. II.—*Of the perſons to whom it was written* - 399

SECT. III.—*Of the contents and deſign of this Epiſtle* 401

CHAP. XXXI.

DISSERTATION ON 1 JOHN V. 7.

SECT. I.—*Previous remarks on this ſubject* - - - - 412

SECT. II.—*Five charges againſt* 1 *John* v. 7, *admitted by Bengel* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 416

SECT. III.—*Of the authorities which have been adduced in favour of* 1 *John* v. 7. - - - - - - - - - 419

SECT. IV.—*The Alogi did not reject the firſt Epiſtle of St. John: conſequently in their time, that is, in the ſecond century, the Epiſtle did not contain the controverted paſſage* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 428

SECT. V.—*Of the reaſons alleged for retaining* 1 John v. 7. *though the evidence of manuſcripts, fathers, and verſions is decidedly againſt it* - - - - - - - - - 431

SECT. VI.

SECT. VI.—*In what manner* 1 *John* v. 7. *was firſt introduced into the Latin verſion, and afterwards into our printed editions of the Greek Teſtament* - page 434

SECT. VII.—*Luther did not admit* 1 *John* v. 7, *into his German verſion of the Bible* - - - - - - - 438

CHAP. XXXII.

OF THE TWO LAST EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN.

SECT. I.—*Of the canonical authority of theſe two Epiſtles* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 442

SECT. II.—*Of the time when theſe Epiſtles were written* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 445

SECT. III.—*Whether the ſecond Epiſtle was ſent to a particular perſon, or to a whole church* - - - - 448

SECT. IV.—*Of the contents, and deſign of the third Epiſtle* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 451

SECT. V.—*Of the perſon of Caius, to whom the third Epiſtle is addreſſed* - - - - - - - - - - 454

CHAP. XXXIII.

OF THE APOCALYPSE.

SECT. I.—*Previous apology for the author's uncertainty, in reſpect to the Apocalypſe* - - - - - - - - 457

SECT. II.—*Teſtimonies of the earlieſt eccleſiaſtical writers, both for and againſt the Apocalypſe* - - - - - 461

SECT. III.—*Inferences deduced from the preceding ſection* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 486

SECT. IV.

SECT. IV.—*Of the opinions of eccleſiaſtical writers, who lived ſince the time of Euſebius* - - - - page 487

SECT. V.—*Of the completion or non-completion of the prophecies contained in the Apocalypſe, conſidered in reſpect to the arguments which they afford in favour of, or againſt its divinity* - - - - - - - - - - 501

SECT. VI.—*Whether the contradictory explanations, which have been hitherto given of the Apocalypſe, ought to be aſcribed to the Apocalypſe itſelf, or to a want of knowledge in the commentators* - - - - - - - - - 506

SECT. VII.—*Further remarks on the different expoſitions of the Apocalypſe* - - - - - - - - - - - - 511

SECT. VIII.—*The ſame ſubject continued* - - - 515

SECT. IX.—*Of the time when the Apocalypſe was written* - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 518

SECT. X—*Of the Greek ſtyle of the Apocalypſe* - 528

SECT. XI.—*Whether the Apocalypſe was originally written in Hebrew* - - - - - - - - - - - - 537

SECT. XII.—*Remarks on the doctrine delivered in the Apocalypſe* - - - - - - - - - - - - 538

ERRATA,

VOL. IV.

PAGE 2. l. 20. for 'ſections of this chapter' read 'chapters.'
13. l. 7. eraſe 'when.'
49. l. 27. for 'facts,' read feats.'
104. l. 22. for 'foretold,' read 'forfeited.'
112. l. 27. for 'that,' read 'not.'
227. l. 2 from the bottom, for 'both,' read 'by both.'
248. l. 25. for 'Ἐβραιους,' read 'Ἑβραιους.'

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

SACRED WRITINGS

OF THE

NEW COVENANT.

CHAP. X.

OF THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL IN GENERAL.

SECT. I.

Of the order, in which St. Paul's Epiſtles are placed in the New Teſtament.

ST. PAUL's Epiſtles are arranged in the New Teſtament, not according to the time, when they were written, but according to the ſuppoſed rank and importance of the communities, or perſons, to which they were addreſſed. Hence the Epiſtles, which were ſent to whole bodies of Chriſtians are placed before thoſe, which were ſent to individuals. Of the former, the Epiſtle to the Romans has the firſt rank, becauſe Rome was the capital of the world: and the two Epiſtles to the Corinthians come next in order, becauſe Corinth was, at the time when St. Paul's Epiſtles were arranged, the principal city of Greece. The Epiſtle to the Galatians is placed in the third rank, becauſe it was addreſſed to a whole nation, which, though conſidered as

leſs important than the cities of Rome, and Corinth, was deemed higher in rank, than other ſingle cities. The Epiſtle to the Philippians was placed before thoſe, which were ſent to the Coloſſians and Theſſalonians, not becauſe Philippi was really a more important place, than either Coloſſæ or Theſſalonica, but becauſe Philippi was miſtakenly ſuppoſed to be the principal city of Macedonia; a ſuppoſition, which aroſe from a falſe interpretation of Acts xvi. 12. Of the Epiſtles addreſſed to individuals, thoſe to Timothy have the firſt rank, becauſe he was a companion of St. Paul: and that to Philemon the laſt, becauſe he does not appear to have been inveſted with any ſpiritual office. However in ſeveral Greek manuſcripts, the Epiſtles of St. Paul are not all arranged according to the common order: for inſtance, in the Codex Vaticanus, the Epiſtle to the Galatians, and that to the Hebrews, the latter of which is placed immediately after the ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians [z].

But in the following ſections of this chapter, I ſhall treat of St. Paul's Epiſtles, not according to the order, in which they are placed in the New Teſtament, but according to the time, when they were written. On the ſubject of St. Paul's Epiſtles, the reader may conſult, Millii Prolegomena, § 4 – 34. Joach. Langii Commentatio de vita et Epiſtolis Pauli, Buddei Eccleſia apoſtolica, Benſon's Hiſtory of the firſt planting the Chriſtian Church, and particularly Lardner's Supplement to his Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory.

[z] See Vol. II. Ch. viii. Sect. 6. under the article Codex Vaticanus.

SECT. II.

St. Paul dictated his Epiſtles, and wrote a greater number, than thoſe which are now extant.

IT was the uſual practice of St. Paul to dictate his Epiſtles *; and in ſome of them he has mentioned after his own name the name of his amanuenſis, Timotheus or Silvanus for inſtance, as Dr. Heumann has ſhewn to be highly probable in his Epiſtola de ſcribis epiſtolarum Pauli. Dr. Hoffmann in his Introductio in lectionem Epiſt. ad Coloſſenſes, Sect. ii. § 3. objects, that in the two Epiſtles to the Theſſalonians, both Timotheus and Silvanus are named after St. Paul. But the Apoſtle in dictating his Epiſtles to the Theſſalonians may have uſed two amanuenſes, one of whom wrote one part, the other the other part of the Epiſtle: and the Theſſalonians who knew the hand-writing both of Timotheus and Silvanus, had in that caſe a ſtill ſtronger proof that the Epiſtle was genuine. Or the one may have written the Epiſtle, and the other, either in conſequence of his approbation of it, or in conſequence of being in ſome reſpect concerned in it, may have deſerved to have his name mentioned with that of the amanuenſis.

The whole number of St. Paul's Epiſtles now extant, even if we include the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, is only fourteen. Now if we conſider the long duration of St. Paul's apoſtolic miniſtry, and the great fluency of his language, it is wholly incredible that theſe are the only Epiſtles, which he ever wrote. But, as Divine Providence has thought proper, that only fourteen ſhould deſcend to poſterity, we have no more reaſon to complain of the loſs of his other Epiſtles, than that ſeveral of Chriſt's ſpeeches, all of which contained the words of God, were not committed to writing. St. Paul in that Epiſtle to the Corinthians, which we call the firſt, alludes in ch. v. 9. to an Epiſtle, which he had already ſent to the

* See Vol. I. Ch. vi. Sect. 2.

the Corinthians, but which is no longer extant. Further, St. Peter in his ſecond Epiſtle ch. iii. 15. appeals to an Epiſtle, which St. Paul had written to thoſe very perſons, to whom he himſelf was writing in confirmation of the doctrine, that 'the day of general judgement was deferred only, to give ſinners an opportunity of repenting.' But among thoſe Epiſtles of St. Paul, which are now extant, there is none, which was addreſſed to all thoſe communities, to which St. Peter addreſſed his two Epiſtles: and in none of them does St. Paul enter into a particular examination of that doctrine in ſupport of which St. Peter had made his appeal [b]. It is probable therefore that St. Peter meant an Epiſtle, which is now loſt [c]. If the reading of the ancient Codex Laudanus 3. and of the Syriac verſion, at Acts xvii. 5. λαβοντες επιστολην απ' αυτε προς τον Σιλαν και Τιμοθεον, were genuine, it would follow that St. Paul, during his ſtay at Athens wrote an Epiſtle to Silas and Timotheus, which is likewiſe loſt. But as this reading is ſupported by only two, though very reſpectable authorities, I ſhall not inſiſt upon it: and I mention it rather, for the ſake of curioſity, than for the ſake of argument.

Dr. F. Stoſch [d], and Dr. Lardner [e], have argued on the other ſide of the queſtion, and have contended that the Epiſtles of St. Paul, which are now extant are the only Epiſtles, which the Apoſtle ever wrote. Their arguments however have not convinced me of the truth of this poſition. Dr. Stoſch endeavours in the firſt place to invalidate the opinion, that St. Paul dictated his Epiſtles, and endeavours to ſhew that the Apoſtle wrote

[b] See the Introduction to the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, § 3.

[c] An objection however to this concluſion may be made from what St. Peter adds in the very next verſe; 'as alſo in *all* his Epiſtles, ſpeaking in them of *theſe* things.'

[d] In his eſſay De Epiſtolis Apoſtolorum idiographis, publiſhed at Wolfenbüttel in 1751: and De Epiſtolis Apoſtolorum non deperditis, publiſhed at Gröningen in 1753.

[e] In his Supplement to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, Vol. III. ch. 25.

wrote them all with his own hand. He thinks that the inſpiration of theſe Epiſtles would have ſuffered, if they had been committed to writing by amanuenſes, who were not inſpired. Now whether this be true or not, it is wholly foreign to the preſent purpoſe: for we muſt not conclude that a thing really did happen, becauſe we fancy, that it would have been better, if it had ſo happened. But I really ſee no greater injury, which could ariſe from the circumſtance that St. Paul's Epiſtles were committed to writing by perſons not inſpired, than from the circumſtance that they have been ſince copied and printed by uninſpired perſons. Beſides, the Apoſtle probably examined them before he ſent them away, and corrected whatever miſtakes had been made by his amanuenſis; which amounts nearly to the ſame, as if he had written them with his own hand. The book of the Prophet Jeremiah was not committed to writing by the Prophet himſelf, but by Baruch his ſcribe[f]: yet we do not therefore ſuppoſe that either its inſpiration or its credibility is impaired.

With reſpect to the poſition that St. Paul wrote more Epiſtles, than thoſe, which are now extant, I muſt beg leave to obſerve, that I do not ground my opinion merely on the above quoted paſſages from the Epiſtles of St. Paul and St. Peter; and therefore, even if it could be ſhewn, that they admit of a different conſtruction from that, which I have put upon them, the opinion would not be confuted. I argue likewiſe from St. Paul's ready ſtyle and flowing language, which is that of an author, who makes writing his buſineſs and his daily practice, not that of a man, who ſuffers whole years to elapſe, without writing a ſingle epiſtle. The compoſitions of St. Paul are of a very remarkable kind: for though they are replete with matter, the author ſeems never to have been at a loſs for the proper turns of expreſſion. The words, which he has uſed, appear to have preſented themſelves without being ſought: yet they are ſo refined and elegant, that the language of St.

[f] Jerem. xxxvi. 4. 17. 18.

St. Paul, though not claſſic Greek, may be conſidered as a pattern of epiſtolary writing. An author, who could write in this manner, muſt certainly have written more than fourteen Epiſtles during the whole courſe of his miniſtry.

But as Dr. Lardner has brought arguments to prove the contrary, and they are really more ſubſtantial than thoſe of Dr. Stoſch, I cannot conclude this ſection without taking notice of them.

1. Lardner argues, 'that we have only four genuine Goſpels, and only one hiſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles: and that we have no reaſon to ſuppoſe that more Goſpels, or more eccleſiaſtical hiſtories, were written by Apoſtles, or Apoſtolic men.'

Anſwer. Theſe premiſes I grant: but I deny the application of them to the Epiſtles of St. Paul. There is a wide difference between writing books, and writing letters. No man of education paſſes his life, without engaging in epiſtolary correſpondence: but not every man ventures to write a book. We muſt not therefore conclude, becauſe only five or ſix what may be called books[g] were written by Apoſtles or Apoſtolic men, that only fourteen letters were written by St. Paul.

2. 'If more Epiſtles had been written, the Apoſtle or Apoſtles, who wrote them would have taken care that they ſhould be preſerved, and tranſmitted to poſterity, as well as thoſe which have actually deſcended to us.'

Anſwer. That it was the will of the Apoſtles, or the deſign of divine Providence, that every Epiſtle written even by divine inſpiration ſhould deſcend to poſterity, is by no means certain. Particular inſtructions might have been neceſſary for certain communities or individuals at the time when they were given, and yet thoſe very inſtructions might be totally uſeleſs to thoſe, who lived in latter ages, and under different circumſtances. Nay,

[g] The four Goſpels, the Acts, and the Apocalypſe: to which might be added, the firſt Epiſtle of St. John, which is more properly a book, than an Epiſtle.

Nay, what is ſtill more, they might not only be uſeleſs, but prejudicial: for, if an Epiſtle be written to perſons in a peculiar ſituation, with which we are unacquainted, we ſhall not only be unable to comprehend it, but ſhall be expoſed to the danger of interpreting it falſely, and of aſcribing therefore to the author doctrines, which he never intended to deliver. It was no more neceſſary, that all the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles ſhould be preſerved, than that all the diſcourſes of Chriſt, which were certainly of not leſs importance, ſhould be recorded by the Evangeliſts, who have thought proper to deliver only a ſelect part of them. A Bible, or book of divine revelation, which is intended as a rule of faith and manners, muſt, at the ſame time that it contains every neceſſary precept, contain them likewiſe in a moderate compaſs. If the Bible conſiſted of many folios, as it probably would, if it contained an account of all the actions and ſpeeches of Chriſt, and all that was written by the Apoſtles, few perſons would read the whole of it; and even of thoſe, who gave themſelves the trouble, perhaps not one would be able to retain in his memory the whole of its contents. This would be a very material inconvenience. For theologians themſelves, who make the ſacred writings their particular ſtudy, would never be able to recollect, when a diſpute aroſe relative to a point of doctrine, whether that doctrine was delivered in the Bible, or not, or at leaſt would be unable to pronounce with certainty, that it were not in the Bible: and to thoſe, who are neither enabled by their education, nor permitted by their temporal occupations, to engage in theological inquiries, the inconvenience would be ſtill greater. Laſtly, as the Bible, moderate as it is at preſent in its ſize, is explained in commentaries, which conſiſt of many folios, what a maſs of commentary would overwhelm us, if the Bible itſelf were as large! Inſtead therefore of ſuppoſing with Lardner, that it was the will of the Apoſtles, that all their Epiſtles ſhould be preſerved, I would conclude that this was no more their intention, than it was the intention of the

Evangeliſts that all the ſpeeches of Chriſt ſhould be recorded.

3. 'No Chriſtian community, which had received an Epiſtle from an Apoſtle, would have ſuffered that Epiſtle to be loſt.'

Anſwer. This argument is applicable only to ſuch Epiſtles, as were of importance: and it is not applicable even to theſe, if it be true, as I have endeavoured to ſhew in a preceding volume [h], that the Apoſtles themſelves were the editors of their own Epiſtles.

CHAP. XI.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

SECT. I.

The Epiſtle to the Galatians is among thoſe, which are now extant, the firſt which St. Paul wrote.

THAT the Epiſtle to the Galatians is the firſt of St. Paul's Epiſtles is the moſt ancient opinion. It was aſſerted in the ſecond century by Marcion [i], whoſe opinion in reſpect to a plain matter of fact is not to be rejected, becauſe he was a heretic. Tertullian likewiſe repreſents St. Paul as a novice in Chriſtianity, when he wrote his Epiſtle to the Galatians [k]: though Tertullian does

[h] Vol. I. Ch. vi. Sect. 2.

[i] See Epiphan. Hæres. XLII. § 9.

[k] Tertullian, in his firſt book againſt Marcion, ch. xx. where the inquiry relates to what St. Paul had written in his Epiſtle to the Galatians, and particularly his cenſure of St. Peter in the ſecond chapter, aſcribes St. Paul's zeal againſt Judaiſm to the recentneſs of his converſion, and to his want of that experience, by which he afterwards learnt to become, as it were, a Jew to the Jews, as well as a Greek to the Greeks. 'Igitur ſi ferventer adhuc, ut Neophytus, adverſus

does not ſay in poſitive terms that this Epiſtle was the firſt. But modern writers have in general rejected this opinion, as the reader will find on conſulting Rumpæi Commentatio critica, p. 121—128. and Lardner's Supplement, p. 154—170. For this reaſon[l], it will be neceſſary to ſtate at large the arguments by which I think it may be ſupported.

St. Paul's firſt viſit to the Galatians was not long after the council, which had been held in Jeruſalem, as appears from Acts xvi. 4, 5, 6. 'and as they (namely, Paul and Silas) went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, which were ordained of the Apoſtles and elders, which were at Jeruſalem: and ſo were the churches eſtabliſhed in the faith, and increaſed in number daily. Now when they had gone through Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghoſt to preach the word in Aſia, &c.' From this paſſage we ſee that St. Paul preached the Goſpel in Galatia; for the prohibition was confined to the Roman Proconſular province of Aſia, to which Galatia is here oppoſed. This is further confirmed by Acts xviii. 23. where St. Luke relates, that St. Paul again viſited Galatia, 'ſtrengthening the diſciples;' ſo that converts muſt have been made on his firſt viſit[m].

Now let us follow St. Paul on his firſt journey from Galatia to Berœa in Macedonia, where he ſeems to have arrived in the ſame year, and we ſhall be convinced that he wrote his Epiſtle to the Galatians upon this journey.

When

adverſus Judaiſmum aliquid in converſatione reprehendendum exiſtimavit, paſſivum ſcilicet convictum, poſtmodum et ipſe uſu omnibus omnia futurus, ut omnes lucraretur, Judæis quaſi Judæus, et eis qui ſub lege, tanquam ſub lege: tu illam ſolius converſationis placituræ poſtea accuſatori ſuo reprehenſionem ſuſpectam vis habeti etiam de prædicationis erga Deum prævaricatione?'

[l] Within theſe few years however, the opinion appears to have met with a more favourable reception.

[m] That Chriſtianity was totally unknown in Galatia, before St. Paul's firſt viſit, I will not aſſert: but, as St. Paul in his Epiſtle to the Galatians treats them as his own ſpiritual children, we muſt conſider their converſion as owing in a great meaſure, if not principally, to St. Paul.

When he left the Galatians he was accompanied by ſeveral brethren, namely, by Silas (or Silvanus), ch. xv. 40. by Timothy, ch. xvi. 3. and perhaps by others. This circumſtance is particularly to be noted. They travelled through Myſia to Troas, ver. 8. where St. Paul had a remarkable dream, which induced him to go into Macedonia. Before he left Troas St. Luke was added to St. Paul's other companions, and in their company he travelled to Philippi, ver. 11. 12. where he preached the Goſpel, ver. 13—40. and thence to Theſſalonica, ch. xvii, 1—9. Here ſome of the brethren appear to have left St. Paul, and he travelled with Silas alone to Berœa, ver. 10. When he was no longer in ſafety here, he left Silas behind him and went to Athens, ſo that when he arrived in that city, none of the brethren were with him, in whoſe company he had travelled from Galatia.

Now St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Galatians is written not only in his own name, but in the name of all the brethren, who were with him[n]. Who then were theſe brethren? Were they known or unknown to the Galatians? St. Paul would hardly have written to them in the name of all the brethren, who were with him, without determining who thoſe brethren were, unleſs they had been the ſame, who attended him when he left Galatia, and who therefore were known to the Galatians without any further deſcription. Conſequently this Epiſtle muſt have been written before St. Paul ſeparated from theſe brethren, that is, before he left Theſſalonica. Whether it was written *in* this city, or before he arrived there, I will not attempt to determine[o]: but it certainly was written during the interval which elapſed between St.

[n] Gal. I. 1. 2.

[o] Perhaps on his journey. For it was his uſual practice to ſend ſalutations at the end of his Epiſtles from the Chriſtian communities eſtabliſhed in the places where he wrote. But at the end of his Epiſtle to the Galatians he has ſent no ſalutations: and therefore it is probable that he wrote neither at Philippi, nor at Theſſalonica, but in a place where no Chriſtian ſociety had been formed.

St. Paul's departure from Galatia, and his departure from Theſſalonica.

There are likewiſe other circumſtances, which confirm this opinion, and ſhew at leaſt that St. Paul wrote to the Galatians ſoon after their converſion. For ch. i. 6. he ſays, 'I marvel that ye are *ſo ſoon* removed from him, that called you into the grace of Chriſt, unto another Goſpel!' This Epiſtle therefore was certainly not written ſo late as Mill, or even ſo late, as Benſon ſuppoſes. Further, it appears from Acts xv. 1. that Aſia Minor ſwarmed at that time with zealots, who wiſhed to impoſe on the Chriſtians the obſervance of the Levitical law: the ſeduction of the Galatians therefore, of which St. Paul complains in his Epiſtle, may be more eaſily referred to that, than to a later period. Again; St. Paul in the two firſt chapters gives the Galatians a general review of his life and conduct from his converſion to the Apoſtolic council in Jeruſalem, and at the furtheſt to his return to Antioch. Here he breaks off his narrative. It is probable therefore, that from that time to the time of his writing to the Galatians, nothing remarkable had happened except their converſion. Laſtly, the ſuppoſition that St. Paul wrote to the Galatians at the period, which I have aſſigned, accounts more eaſily than any other, for St. Paul's mentioning to the Galatians that he had not obliged Titus to undergo the rite of circumciſion: namely, becauſe he had obliged Timothy to ſubmit to it, immediately before his firſt viſit to the Galatians[p], and St. Paul's adverſaries had appealed perhaps to this fact, in ſupport of their doctrine, that the Levitical law ſhould be retained.

The particular year of the Chriſtian Era, in which the Epiſtle to the Galatians was written, it is difficult to determine with preciſion: though we are eſpecially intereſted in the date of this Epiſtle, becauſe it appears from ch. iv. 10. that the Galatians were on the point of celebrating the Jewiſh ſabbatical year, and, in conſequence of their ſeduction by the Jewiſh zealots, of leaving their lands

[p] Acts xvi. 3.

lands uncultivated for a whole year, though the law of Moſes on this article could not poſſibly extend to Galatia. At the beginning of the ſecond chapter, there is a date, from which ſome commentators have attempted to fix the year, in which this Epiſtle was written. Namely, St. Paul ſays, ch. ii. 1. επειτα δια δεκατεσσαρων ετων παλιν ανεβην εις Ιεροσολυμα. But the difficulty is to determine from what period St. Paul reckoned theſe fourteen years. Some reckon from the time of his converſion: others from that journey to Jeruſalem, which he mentions ch. i. 18. and thus make St. Paul's arrival in Jeruſalem, ch. ii. 1. to have happened ſeventeen years after his converſion. And even if this point were ſettled, the year of St. Paul's converſion will ſtill remain to be decided[g]. Some commentators conjecture, that St. Paul was converted in the year 35. On this hypotheſis the Epiſtle to the Galatians, which was evidently written ſoon after the council in Jeruſalem, muſt be referred to the year 49 or the year 52, according as we add 14, or 14+3 to 35. Other commentators place St. Paul's converſion in the year 38. On this latter hypotheſis therefore the Epiſtle to the Galatians will be referred, either to 52 or to 55. But it could not be written ſo late as 55, becauſe St. Paul's impriſonment in Jeruſalem took place in the year 60, and I have already ſhewn[h], that between his firſt journey into Macedonia, on which he wrote his Epiſtle to the Galatians, and his impriſonment in Jeruſalem, there muſt have elapſed an interval of more than five years. Since therefore neither the year of St. Paul's converſion can be determined with any preciſion, nor the period decided, from which he counted the fourteen years, which he has mentioned Gal. ii. 1. we ſhall not be able from this date to fix the time, when the Epiſtle was written.

I have obſerved in the beginning of the preceding paragraph, that the Galatians, when St. Paul wrote his Epiſtle to them, were on the point of celebrating the Jewiſh ſabbatical year. If therefore this ſabbatical year could

[g] See above, Ch. viii. Sect. 4. [h] Ib.

could be determined, we might ſettle at once the date of our Epiſtle. But here again a difficulty preſents itſelf; for we are not certain in what manner the Jews reckoned their ſabbatical years[a]: whether they conſtantly adhered to the ſeventh year, and thus made the eighth ſabbatical year fall in the 56th year from the time they began to count; or whether, when they began a new reckoning with the year of Jubilee, or the 50th year, and placed the next ſabbatical year in the 57th. Further we know not with what year the Jews began their new ſeries after their return from the captivity: whether they began to reckon immediately from the time of their arrival in Paleſtine, or whether they waited till their lands were in a ſtate of general cultivation. In the firſt book of the Maccabees, ch. vi. 53. mention is made of a ſabbatical year, the only one on record in the Jewiſh hiſtory. This ſabbatical year correſponds to the year 150 of the Greeks, and 161 before Chriſt. Now if we begin to reckon with 160 before Chriſt, and adopt the opinion that the Jews conſtantly adhered to the ſeventh year, we ſhall find that the year 50 after Chriſt was a ſabbatical year: for 160 and 50 make 210 which is exactly 30 times 7. But in fact we ſhould begin to reckon a year earlier: for the paſſage in the book of the Maccabees relates to the latter half of the ſabbatical year, when the want of a harveſt occaſioned a famine. Conſequently this ſabbatical year began in the year 162 before Chriſt: and therefore the year 49 after Chriſt is properly the thirtieth ſabbatical year from that time. Now the date 49 agrees with another calculation of the year when the Epiſtle to the Galatians was written, as appears from the preceding paragraph: and the coincidence of theſe two calculations is a circumſtance in favour of both. The preceding calculation from ſabbatical years will indeed fall to the ground, if it be true that the Jews began a new reckoning with each Jubilee: but as our preſent queſtion does not admit perhaps of an

[a] See the Orient. Bib. Vol. X. p. 17—25.

an abſolute deciſion, the year 49 may be propoſed, as the moſt probable date of the Epiſtle to the Galatians[t].

I will not tire the reader with an examination of what other critics have advanced on this ſubject, ſince the taſk has been already performed by Lardner[u]: but ſhall mention only what the various opinions are: 1. The firſt is, that it was written during St. Paul's viſit in Corinth, Acts xviii. 1. and (as is aſſumed without authority) in the year 51 or 52. This is the opinion, which Lardner adopts. 2dly. That it was written at Epheſus, Acts xviii. 23. 24. 3dly. At the ſame time, that the Epiſtle to the Romans was written, Acts xx. 2. 4. 4thly. That it was written at Rome. This laſt opinion is the moſt improbable of any: for if St. Paul had deferred it till his arrival at Rome, he could not have complained in the Epiſtle, that the Galatians had *ſo ſoon* wavered in their faith, nor would he have been ſilent on his bonds in Rome, of which we find no traces in the whole Epiſtle. Yet this opinion, ſtrange as it is, is advanced in the ſubſcription to this Epiſtle in the Greek manuſcripts[w], and in the Syriac and Arabic verſions. From this example alone we may learn, that the ſubſcriptions annexed to the Epiſtles are entitled to no credit.

SECT. II.

Of the Galatian Chriſtians, and their ſeducers.

THE Galatians were deſcended from a tribe of Gauls who had formerly invaded Greece, and afterwards ſettled in the leſſer Aſia. Their original Gauliſh language they retained even ſo late as the fifth century, as appears

[t] Probably likewiſe in the autumn, or at the time, when in other years, the land was tilled; but in the ſabbatical year remained fallow.

[u] Supplement, Vol. II. ch. xii.

[w] Προς Γαλατας εγγραφη απο Ρωμης.

appears from the teſtimony of Jerom, who relates that their dialect was nearly the ſame with that of the Treviri[x]. At the ſame time they ſpoke the Greek language, in common with almoſt all the inhabitants of the leſſer Aſia: and therefore St. Paul's Greek Epiſtle was perfectly intelligible to them.

John Joachim Schmidt, maſter of the grammar ſchool at Ilfeld, has endeavoured, in his Prohuſio de Galatis, ad quos Paulus literas miſit, to ſupport the extraordinary opinion, that the Galatians to whom St. Paul wrote, did not reſide within the limits of the country of Galatia, but were the inhabitants of Derbe and Lyſtra, which, though really cities of Lycaonia, were conſidered as an appendage to Galatia, becauſe they had been preſented by Auguſtus to Amyntas, King of Galatia. But ſince St. Paul preached the Goſpel in Galatia itſelf, as well as at Derbe and Lyſtra, I can ſee no reaſon for taking the term 'Galatians' in St. Paul's Epiſtle, in any other than its proper acceptation. Schmidt indeed contends[y], not only that St. Paul was never in Galatia before the council at Jeruſalem, which I readily grant, but likewiſe that the perſons, whom St. Paul calls Galatians were already converted to Chriſtianity, when that council was held. This poſition he endeavours to prove from Gal. ii. 5. where St. Paul ſays, 'To whom we gave place by ſubjection, no not for an hour, that the truth of the Goſpel might *continue* with you.' But by the term 'you' St. Paul might mean the Heathens in general, whoſe cauſe he pleaded at Jeruſalem, in oppoſition to thoſe, who wiſhed to enforce the Levitical law: at leaſt he has frequently uſed the term in this ſenſe, and if this may be aſcribed to it in the place in queſtion, the argument will

[x] Galatas, excepto ſermone, Græco, quo omnis loquitur Oriens, propriam linguam eandem pene habere, quam Treviri: nec referre, ſi aliqua exinde corruperint, quum et Aphri Phœnicum linguam nonnulla ex parte mutaverint, et ipſa Latinitas et regionibus quotidie mutetur, et tempore. T. IV. p. 256. ed. Benedict. On this ſubject Jerom is very good authority: for he had ſpent ſome time at Treves, and therefore was well able to judge of the language of the Treviri.

[y] Sect. 6.

will prove nothing of any one community in particular. Further, that by the term 'you' St. Paul meant the inhabitants of Derbe and Lyſtra is highly improbable; becauſe it appears from Acts xvi. 1. that he not only viſited thoſe cities ſoon after the council at Jeruſalem, but informed them verbally of the reſult of this council: conſequently, he was under no neceſſity of giving them written information. On the other hand, if he had judged it neceſſary to write to them, after verbal information, he would at leaſt have given ſome hint in his Epiſtle, that what he then wrote to them he had formerly delivered in perſon[z].

The ſeducers, againſt whom St. Paul writes in his Epiſtle to the Galatians, were men of a very different deſcription from the weak brethren, of whom he ſpeaks in his Epiſtle to the Romans ch. xiv. xv. and other places; and whoſe errors he cenſures in ſo gentle a manner, as even to recommend an abſtinence in their preſence from whatever they imagined to be unlawful. Theſe weak brethren anxiouſly abſtained from meats offered to idols, and from blood: conſidering a participation of the former as a violation of natural, as well as of the Moſaic religion, and a participation of the latter, as an infringement on the command given not only to the Jews in particular, but to the deſcendants of Noah in general, Gen. ix. 4. It was out of tenderneſs to theſe weak brethren, that the council in Jeruſalem had commanded an abſtinence from meats offered to idols, and from blood: and it was the ſame motive, which induced St. Paul in ſeveral paſſages, for inſtance, Rom. xiv. xv. 1 Cor. viii. x. to recommend the ſame abſtinence, whenever ſuch perſons were preſent. Beſide theſe two articles, it does not appear that they inſiſted on any other of the Moſaic inſtitutions, except the obſervance of the Jewiſh ſabbath,

[z] To theſe objections Schmidt has replied in a Programma publiſhed in 1754 with the following title; Prolufionem ſuam de Galatis—ab objectionibus doctiſſimorum virorum vindicare conatur: which the reader may conſult, if he wiſhes to determine, whether the objections are fully anſwered.

ſabbath [a], which however, as far as we have any knowledge of this matter, they did not conſider as indiſpenſably neceſſary for the converts from Heatheniſm. But the ſeducers or diſturbers of the Galatians went much greater lengths, and maintained the neceſſity of obſerving the whole of the Levitical law, including not only circumciſion, and an abſtinence from all meats deemed unclean, but alſo an obſervance of all the Jewiſh feſtivals, and even of the ſabbatical year, which was never deſigned to be obſerved in any other country than Paleſtine. It appears that they began their reformation with exerciſing the rite of circumciſion: and therefore St. Paul warns the Galatians, ch. v. 2. 3. not to ſubmit to it, becauſe by this ceremony they would profeſs themſelves to be Jews, and therefore lay themſelves under the obligations of the Jewiſh law. Perſons of a ſimilar deſcription with thoſe, who diſturbed the Galatians, had diſquieted the Chriſtians in Antioch, till they were ſilenced by the Apoſtles and Elders in Jeruſalem. They were Jews of the New Phariſaic ſect, founded by Judas Galilæus, a ſect which in various points differed from the ancient Phariſees [b]. The Apoſtle ſpeaks of them not only in the Epiſtle to the Galatians, ch. ii. 4. v. 10. 11. vi. 12. 13. but likewiſe in his Epiſtle to the Philippians, ch. i. 16. iii. 2. 18. 19.: and he deſcribes them as men of really bad characters, whoſe principal object was to enrich themſelves at the expence of thoſe, whom they pretended to convert. Nor is the picture which St. Paul has drawn of them in the leaſt exaggerated: for it appears from the accounts of Joſephus, that he might have juſtly repreſented them in a ſtill more odious light. It was in fact this ſect, which involved the Jewiſh nation in that war, which ended with the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, for they incited their countrymen to diſobedience againſt the Roman Emperor, and to a refuſal of the accuſtomed tribute. Under the maſk of piety they committed

[a] Rom. xiv. 4. 5.

[b] See the Moſaic Law, § 184. where I have given an extract from Joſephus, relative to this ſect.

committed rapine and murder, even within the walls of the temple: and their impetuoſity was ſuch, that they reſpected not the power of the Romans, but provoked them to open hoſtilities. They not only introduced themſelves into the Chriſtian communities, but pretended to preach even the Chriſtian religion, as appears from the Epiſtles to the Galatians and Epheſians. The old Phariſaic ſect, as it exiſted in the time of Chriſt, encompaſſed ſea and land to make one proſelyte [c], not becauſe they wiſhed to promote religion and virtue, but becauſe they expected to be amply repaid for their miſſion. Joſephus [d] has related a remarkable inſtance of four Jews, who had perſuaded Fulvia, a Roman lady of rank and fortune, to adopt their religion, and extorted from her conſiderable ſums, as preſents for the holy temple, which, inſtead of ſending to Jeruſalem, they retained in their own coffers: till the matter became publickly known, and was at length reported to Tiberius, who immediately ordered the Jews to leave Rome, and ſent four thouſand of them to Sardinia. As ſoon as the Chriſtian religion began to ſpread itſelf among the Gentiles, and every where met with a favourable reception, they found their advantage in preaching Chriſtianity, which they taught, as if it were nothing more than a reformed Judaiſm, and therefore they ſtrictly enjoined the rite of circumciſion. In this manner they endeavoured to make the Chriſtians become partly Jews, and by placing them as it were in the middle between the two religions, they acquired an opportunity of completing the converſion, as ſoon as circumſtances, and their own profits, would permit.

St. Paul therefore in his Epiſtle to the Galatians ſpeaks of their ſeducers in ſeverer terms, than he has uſed on other occaſions, eſpecially in ch. i. 8. 9. It may be ſaid indeed that, as this Epiſtle was the firſt which St. Paul wrote, the fire of youth is more conſpicuous in this, than in any other: and that, ſince it was written with his own hand, not dictated according to his

[c] Math. xxviii. 15. [d] Antiquit. xviii. 3. 5.

his ſubſequent practice, the Apoſtle more eaſily gave way to the ſuggeſtions of his naturally warm diſpoſition. But if we reflect that the ſeducers of the Galatians were men of a different deſcription from the weak brethren, whom he deſcribes in other places, he might have uſed the ſame ſeverity of expreſſion, at whatever time, and under whatever circumſtances he wrote. In fact the propagation of Chriſtianity could have met with no greater impediment, than that, which theſe perſons had thrown in its way: for they not only clogged the religion of Chriſt with ceremonies which were become obſolete, but taught the obſervance of them as the true means of obtaining eternal ſalvation. Of thoſe who thus adopt the Levitical law, St. Paul very properly ſays, ch. v. 2. 'Behold, I Paul ſay unto you that if ye be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing, and ver. 4. Chriſt is become of no effect unto you, whoſoever of you are juſtified by the law; ye are fallen from grace'[e]. Nor is the Epiſtle to the Galatians the only one, in which St. Paul has ſeverely reprimanded thoſe, who inſiſted on the Levitical law as the means of ſalvation: for we find examples in the Epiſtle to the Romans, ch. xvi. 17. 18. 20. and in that to the Philippians, ch. iii. 2. 18. 19. The Apoſtles alſo and Elders aſſembled in council at Jeruſalem, repreſented thoſe, who taught the neceſſity of circumciſing the Gentile converts, as men who ſubverted the Souls of the Chriſtians[f].

The principal arguments, uſed by the ſeducers of the Galatians, were the following.

1. 'That the Apoſtles at Jeruſalem, eſpecially St. Peter, and likewiſe the whole church at Jeruſalem, conſidered circumciſion as neceſſary; that St. Paul was only a deputy from that church, and that his doctrine was authoritative only ſo far, as it agreed with the doctrine of the church of Jeruſalem.' That the former part of this aſſertion

[e] It is evident that St. Paul did not mean to include thoſe, who retained circumciſion, merely through weakneſs of underſtanding, or a falſe tenderneſs of conſcience.

[f] Ανασκευαζοντες τας Ψυχας υμων. Act. xv. 24.

aſſertion is falſe, appears both from Acts xv. 24. and from the two firſt chapters of the Epiſtle to the Galatians. And that the latter part is equally falſe appears from the ſame Epiſtle, where St. Paul ſhews at large, that he was neither a miſſionary from the church at Jeruſalem, nor a diſciple of the Apoſtles, but an immediate Apoſtle of Chriſt himſelf, that the Goſpel, which he preached, was delivered to him by a divine revelation, and that its truth therefore by no means depended on its agreement with what the other Apoſtles taught. It was abſolutely neceſſary that St. Paul ſhould be explicit on this ſubject, becauſe, Galatia being at ſome diſtance from Paleſtine, the inhabitants of that country could be the more eaſily deceived in reſpect to the doctrines, which were taught by the Apoſtles and Elders in Jeruſalem.

2. 'That St. Paul had altered his opinion, and now preached the Levitical law.' Galat. i. 8. 10. v. 11. Perhaps they pleaded in ſupport of this argument that St. Paul had ordered Timothy to be circumciſed ſhortly before his firſt viſit to the Galatians. Acts xvi. 3. compared with Galat. ii. 3.

3. 'That all the promiſes of God were made to the poſterity of Abraham, and that whoever would partake of the bleſſing upon Abraham, muſt like Abraham be circumciſed. This objection St. Paul anſwers, ch. iii. 7—iv. 18.

4. 'That Iſaiah had foretold an approaching converſion of the Gentiles, and had promiſed children from among the Heathen to Jeruſalem or Sion. If therefore the Gentiles deſired to be children of Jeruſalem they ought to conform to the worſhip and ceremonies of that church.' In anſwer to this argument, St. Paul ſhews ch. iv. 9—31. that theſe children were promiſed, not to the Jewiſh, but to the ancient Jeruſalem, where the true God was worſhipped in the time of Melchiſedek, without either temple or Levitical law.

There are two paſſages in the Epiſtle to the Galatians, ch. ii. 14. iv. 12. which ſeem to imply, that not only St.

St. Paul, but even St. Peter, when they were in company with heathens totally diſregarded the Levitical law, and partook of meats, which the Jews conſidered as unclean. It is true that this was no crime, ſince the Levitical law had ceaſed to be binding: yet it was contrary to St. Paul's practice at other times, for as a native Jew, he himſelf ſtill obſerved the law. He even made the Nazarite vow, ſhaved his head at Cenchreæ, and then went up to Jeruſalem to celebrate the approaching feſtival and make the uſual offerings[g]: and a few years afterwards, when he was at Jeruſalem for the laſt time, he repeated the Nazarite ceremonies[h], in order to convince the Jews, as is expreſsly ſaid, Acts xxi. 24. that he 'walked orderly and kept the law.' It may be aſked therefore whether St. Peter and St. Paul obſerved at one time, but diſregarded at another, the Levitical law, according to the difference of the circumſtances, in which they were placed[i]. Tertullian, as appears from the paſſage quoted at the beginning of the preceding ſection, anſwers this queſtion in the affirmative. But I would rather anſwer it in the negative, and aſſert that both St. Peter and St. Paul abſtained in general from unclean meats, even when in company with heathens. In fact I cannot ſuppoſe, that any man, who had invited them into his houſe, could have violated the laws of hoſpitality in ſuch a manner, as to preſent them with meats, of which they as native Jews were not accuſtomed to partake. St. Peter eſpecially, who paid great reſpect to the Jewiſh ceremonies[k], would have carefully avoided a participation, which muſt have offended his countrymen, and conſequently have diminiſhed his own importance among them. And St. Paul had ſo many enemies among the Jews, that, if in his own conduct he had openly violated the

[g] Acts xviii. 18. 20. 21. 22.

[h] Acts xxi. 20—27. xxiv. 17. 18.

[i] This queſtion relates merely to the manner, in which themſelves *acted* on different occaſions: and is very different from the queſtion, whether they *taught* different doctrines at different times.

[k] Acts x. xi.

the Levitical law, they would not have neglected to charge him with this violation, when he was publickly accuſed at Jeruſalem and Cæſarea. Yet in Acts xxiii. 1—10. xxiv. 1—21. we meet with no charge of any ſuch kind. I believe therefore that the two paſſages above quoted from the Epiſtle to the Galatians imply, not that St. Peter and St. Paul partook of unclean meats in company with heathens, but merely that they did not refuſe to aſſociate at table with heathens, and to eat in their houſes, which the Jews in general avoided[1], even if nothing was produced which was contrary to their law. For the veſſels themſelves, in which the food was prepared, they conſidered as unclean: nor were they certain that among the various ingredients there was no intermixture of ſomething forbidden. Hence St. Paul himſelf ſays, Galat. vi. 13. that the circumciſed themſelves did not obſerve every tittle of the law, ſignifying, as I underſtand the paſſage, that the Jews neither did nor could obſerve the ſtrict letter of the law, when they reſided in heathen countries.

Some writers have concluded from the Epiſtle to the Galatians, that St. Peter and St. Paul were not agreed as to the neceſſity of retaining the Levitical law, but on the contrary, that they taught very different doctrines on this ſubject. Now it is true, that in one inſtance, St. Peter, to avoid giving offence to the Jews, withdrew himſelf from the Gentile converts at Antioch: yet the Epiſtle to the Galatians is ſo far from proving that St. Peter thought differently from St. Paul in reſpect to the Levitical law, that it ſhews they entertained the very ſame ſentiments. This further appears from Acts x. xi. xv. and from what St. Peter himſelf has written in his firſt Epiſtle.

[1] Acts x. 28. Αθεμιτον εστιν ανδρι Ιουδαιῳ κολλασθαι ἡ προσιεχεσθαι ἀλλοφυλῳ.

CHAP. XII.

OF THE TWO EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

SECT. I.

Of the time when St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians.

THE two Epiſtles to the Theſſalonians are the next in point of chronology to the Epiſtle to the Galatians. Theſſalonica, originally called Thermæ, till its name was changed by Philip in conſequence of a victory over the Theſſalians, was in the time of St. Paul the capital of Macedonia. In this city was a very numerous colony of Jews, and their ſynagogue was ſo celebrated, that St. Luke[m] calls it by way of eminence ἡ συναγωγη, or, the ſynagogue: and even to this very day Salonike, as the place is now called, abounds with Jewiſh families. Now as the Jews were the firſt perſecutors of chriſtianity, we ſee the reaſon why the Theſſalonian community was more expoſed to perſecution, than any other.

St. Paul preached the Goſpel at Theſſalonica, after he had taught at Philippi[n], and in the ſame year, in which he wrote his Epiſtle to the Galatians. Some few among the Jews received the Goſpel, and the Apoſtle endeavoured to prove to them the truth of Chriſtianity from the prophecies of the Old Teſtament[o]. But a great number of the heathens, who, though they had not been circumciſed, had learned to worſhip the one true God, and are therefore called σεβομενοι Ἑλληνες, became converts to Chriſt. Hence the majority of this church conſiſted of native heathens, who had formerly been idolaters[p]: and it is not improbable that Chriſtianity had been propagated even among the idolatrous heathens. The Jews,

[m] Acts xvii. 1.

[n] Acts xvii. 1.

[o] Ver. 2—4.

[p] 1 Theſſ. i. 9.

Jews, ever jealous of the admiſſion of the Gentiles to the ſame privileges with themſelves, were highly offended with the Apoſtle's conduct, and raiſed therefore ſuch a diſturbance, that St. Paul and Silas were obliged to quit Theſſalonica after a reſidence of only three weeks. Not content with driving St. Paul from Theſſalonica, before the Chriſtian community was thoroughly eſtabliſhed, they carried their malice ſo far as to follow him even to Berœa: which place they obliged him likewiſe to quit and to fly to Athens. Silas and Timothy ſtaid behind at Berœa, but they received orders from St. Paul to follow him as ſoon as poſſible[q]: and at Athens St. Paul waited for them[r]. Their actual arrival there is not mentioned by St. Luke[s]: but that they really came thither to St. Paul appears from 1 Theſſ. iii. 1. 2. Timothy however ſtaid only a ſhort time with St. Paul, who ſent him back to Theſſalonica[t]: and before Timothy's return St. Paul had left Athens, and was gone to Corinth, whither Timothy followed him[u].

Now as St. Paul has mentioned in his firſt Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, not only Timothy's departure to Theſſalonica, but likewiſe his return[w], it follows that this Epiſtle was written, not at Athens, as the ſubſcription imports, but at Corinth, where St. Paul ſpent a year and a half. I once thought it probable that the Epiſtle was written during the former part of this period: but it appears to me at preſent, that he wrote it rather in the latter part of this interval, after he had made ſeveral excurſions from Corinth. St. Paul ſays to the Theſſalonians, ch. i. 7. that their conduct was ſuch, as made them an example for all the believers in Macedonia and Achaia, and ver. 7. 8. 9. he adds, 'For from you ſounded out the word of the Lord not only in Macedonia

[q] Acts xvii. 14. 15. [r] Acts xvii. 16.

[s] St. Luke's ſilence in reſpect to this matter is not extraordinary, becauſe he was not preſent with St. Paul at Athens, having ſtaid behind at Philippi. See above, ch. vi. ſect. 3.

[t] 1 Theſſ. iii. 1—5. [u] Acts xviii. 5. [w] 1 Theſſ. iii. 1—6.

Macedonia and Achaia, but alſo in every place your faith in God is ſpread abroad, ſo that we need not ſpeak any thing: for they themſelves ſhew of us what reception we had with you, and how ye turned to God from idols, to ſerve the living and true God, and to wait for his ſon,' &c. From this paſſage we muſt conclude that St. Paul had been in various places, after he had founded the church at Theſſalonica: and it is not improbable, that during the year and an half above-mentioned he made ſeveral excurſions from Corinth, one of which was perhaps to the iſland of Crete, as I ſhall endeavour to ſhew in the chapter, which relates to the Epiſtle to Titus. Further, in ch. ii. 17. 18. he ſays, 'But we, brethren, being taken from you a ſhort time in preſence, and in heart, endeavoured the more abundantly to ſee your face with great deſire. Wherefore, we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again, but Satan hindered us.' Since therefore St. Paul had ſeveral times formed a reſolution of reviſiting Theſſalonica, and had ſeveral times been prevented [x], it is evident that this Epiſtle was written, neither ſoon after St. Paul's arrival at Corinth, nor even ſoon after Timothy had arrived there from Macedonia. The particular year of the Chriſtian Era I cannot pretend to determine: for theſe determinations, as I have already obſerved [y], are very precarious. But if the Epiſtle to the Galatians was written at the end of the year 49, the firſt Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians was written probably about the year 51.

[x] By what accidents he had been prevented St. Paul does not ſay: but as during the courſe of his life he thrice ſuffered ſhipwreck (2 Cor. xi. 25.) it is not impoſſible that one of them happened in the interval, which elapſed between his departure from Theſſalonica and the writing of his firſt Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians.

[y] Ch. xi. Sect. 1.

SECT. II.

Of the circumſtances of the Church at Theſſalonica.

THE principal circumſtances of the Chriſtian community at Theſſalonica, as far as is neceſſary to a right underſtanding of St. Paul's two Epiſtles, are the following.

It conſiſted, as was mentioned in the preceding ſection, for the moſt part of Gentile, and of ſome few Jewiſh converts. As it is hardly credible, that St. Paul at his departure appointed thoſe to be teachers, who only three weeks before were wholly unacquainted with revealed religion, it is probable that the teachers mentioned ch. v. 12. were converts from Judaiſm, or at leaſt ſuch Greeks, as had already embraced the Jewiſh religion.

2. The newly founded community had made indeed ſome progreſs in the faith: but being ſtill in an imperfect ſtate, and oppreſſed by the powerful Jews at Theſſalonica, it was in ſome danger, and ſtood in need therefore of freſh ſupport, to enable them to ſtand firm in the doctrine, which they had embraced. This ſupport the Apoſtle gives them in the three firſt chapters of the firſt Epiſtle, and endeavours to convince them, both by his own conduct, and by the imparted gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, that the Goſpel which he preached, was true in itſelf, and of divine origin.

3. There prevailed an error, relative to the doctrine of the laſt judgement, which might have created great confuſion in this community. The Theſſalonians, like moſt of the primitive Chriſtians, ſuppoſed that the day of judgement was not far diſtant, and that it would happen in the age, in which they themſelves lived. Further, they imagined that they who ſurvived this day, would have a great advantage over thoſe, who were deceaſed: which was probably to conſiſt in their entering

immediately into the Millennium, of which ſome of the primitive Chriſtians entertained very ſtrange notions. And on this account they lamented the death of their friends, as they ſuppoſed that it deprived them of privileges to be enjoyed by thoſe, who were alive and remained on earth at the general judgement. This error St. Paul endeavours to remove in the latter part of the fourth chapter. In the ſecond Epiſtle, ch. ii. 2. we find an intimation, that not only Epiſtles were forged in St. Paul's name, to propagate this error, but that certain calculations and falſe prophecies were alſo applied to the ſame purpoſe. With reſpect to the falſe prophecies, I ſhall not venture to hazard even a conjecture, for it is very poſſible that they were merely verbal, and never committed to writing: and therefore all that I have ſaid in the firſt edition, on the Revelation of Cerinthus, I here retract. But of the calculation, of which St. Paul ſpeaks, and which he terms λογος, I believe the true meaning to be, as follows. The Jews in general believed that the Meſſiah would erect a temporal kingdom, in which they were to enjoy liberty and reſt: and of this kingdom they conſidered their ſabbath as a type[z]. Hence they concluded, that it muſt commence at leaſt as early as the beginning of the ſixth Millennium from the creation of the world: and they thought it not improbable, that it would begin much ſooner. For as the moſt devout Jews did not wait till ſun ſet, but began their ſabbath and abſtinence from labour ſeveral hours before, ſo they imagined that the Deity would begin the great ſabbath ſeveral hours, that is centuries, before the ſix thouſand years from the creation were expired. It is true that according to the Chronology of the Hebrew Bible, as the text now ſtands in our manuſcripts, the end of the ſixth Millennium was ſo far removed, that even after a deduction of ſeveral centuries,

[z] It would be foreign to the preſent purpoſe, to inquire, whether this notion were grounded or not. It will be ſufficient to obſerve that the moſt learned Jews of the preſent age reject it, though ſeveral modern Chriſtians, eſpecially Vitringa, have retained it.

centuries, no man in the time of St. Paul could expect to ſurvive it. But every one knows that there are conſiderable variations in reſpect to the years mentioned in the book of Geneſis: which make the creation of the world to have taken place at an earlier period, than it is made in our Hebrew Bibles. In the Septuagint, the number of years mentioned in the fifth and eleventh chapters of Geneſis, is ſuch as advance the duration of the world, in the time of St. Paul, far into the ſixth Millennium: but how far I will not attempt to determine, for not all the copies even of the Septuagint have the ſame numbers in the eleventh chapter of Geneſis, as may be ſeen on comparing the editions of Grabe and Breitinger, which follow the Codex Alexandrinus, with the editions which contain the text of the Codex Vaticanus. Further, the very uncertainty, which attended the calculation, gave the greater ſcope to the imagination of enthuſiaſts, to fix the commencement of the ſeventh Millennium, and of the temporal kingdom which they expected, at a period the moſt ſuitable to their wiſhes. And, if the world at that time had really exiſted above 5500 years, they had ſome ground for concluding, according to their principles, that the grand Millennium was not far diſtant. Theſe notions inſinuated themſelves very early among the Chriſtians: and they were received not only by the Theſſalonians, but by ſeveral of the ancient fathers.

4. Among the converts at Theſſalonica, there were ſeveral, who refuſed to ſubject themſelves to the teachers, and, under the pretence of edifying others, behaved themſelves diſorderly. Theſe perſons St. Paul had in view, 1 Theſſ. v. 11—14.

The ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians was occaſioned by the ſame motives, which induced the Apoſtle to write his firſt Epiſtle. As this had not produced its proper effect, and ſeveral members of the Theſſalonian community ſtill maintained that the day of judgement was at hand, and others continued their diſorderly conduct, the Apoſtle thought it neceſſary to write to them again very

very ſoon after he had written his firſt Epiſtle. In his ſecond Epiſtle therefore he endeavours to ſhew from ſome prophecies of the Old Teſtament not then fulfilled, that the day of judgement was not ſo ſoon to be expected: and at the ſame time he cautions the Theſſalonians againſt idleneſs and irregularity.

It was the opinion of Grotius, that what is called the ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians was in fact the firſt Epiſtle, which St. Paul wrote to them. This opinion he grounds on 2 Theſſ. iii. 17. where the Apoſtle ſays, 'The ſalutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epiſtle: ſo I write.' Hence Grotius concluded that this was the firſt Epiſtle, which St. Paul wrote to the Theſſalonians, becauſe he taught them in what manner they were to diſtinguiſh his genuine Epiſtles from thoſe, which were forged in his name. But this inference is ungrounded, for a writer does not always think it neceſſary in the very firſt Epiſtle to give the tokens of authenticity. On the contrary, it is more probable that he would do this, after letters had been forged in his name, than at the beginning of the correſpondence.

CHAP. XIII.

OF THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

SECT. I.

Of the perſon and character of Titus.

ST. PAUL's Epiſtle to Titus might not improperly be called an Epiſtle to the Cretans: for the deſign of it was not ſo much to inſtruct Titus in matters, which he muſt have known even without this Epiſtle, as to put

put into his hands an order, which he might lay before the Cretans, and to which he might appeal whenever unworthy and unqualified perſons attempted to intrude into the epiſcopal office. The contents of this Epiſtle are nearly of the ſame kind as thoſe of the firſt Epiſtle to Timothy. The churches in Crete were hitherto without biſhops and miniſters: Titus therefore was ordered to appoint them, and at the ſame time was cautioned againſt ſome, who were of the circumciſion, and who endeavoured to procure for themſelves the eccleſiaſtical offices [a]. Of the perſon and character of Titus we have no further knowledge, than what is related in the New Teſtament: from which it appears that he was by birth a heathen, that he was not circumciſed [b], as Timothy was, that he ſometimes accompanied St. Paul, and was ſometimes ſent as deputy to Chriſtian communities.

It is remarkable that St. Luke has not once mentioned the name of Titus throughout the Acts of the Apoſtles, though St. Paul makes frequent mention of him in his Epiſtles. But St. Luke's ſilence will ceaſe to be extraordinary, when we conſider the period, in which Titus attended St. Paul. He was preſent with the Apoſtle at three different times. Firſt, on that journey to Jeruſalem, which is deſcribed Acts xv. as St. Paul himſelf in his Epiſtle to the Galatians [c] relates in expreſs terms. But in this inſtance, though St. Luke has not mentioned him by name, he has included him under the general expreſſion 'ſeveral other of them' [d], namely of the Gentile converts. From this period, as far as we may judge from the Epiſtles of St. Paul, ſome time muſt have elapſed, before Titus was again with him: but in the ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians the name of Titus is frequently mentioned [e], where it appears that he had been with St. Paul at Epheſus, and was ſent from that city

[a] Of theſe eccleſiaſtical offices, I ſhall treat in the Notes to the Epiſtle to Titus, and to the firſt Epiſtle to Timothy.

[b] Gal. ii. 3. [c] Ch. ii. 1. 3. [d] Acts xv. 2.

[e] Ch. ii. 13. vii. 6. 13. 14. viii. 6. 16. 23. xii. 18.

city to Corinth. St. Paul, on his own departure from Epheſus, expected to meet Titus again at Troas: but in this expectation he was diſappointed[f], for he did not meet with him, till his arrival in Macedonia[g], whence [c]the Apoſtle ſent Titus again with a new commiſſion to [a]Corinth. Now theſe engagements of Titus took place during the period in which St. Luke was abſent from St. Paul[h]; and this is the reaſon why he is ſilent in reſpect to the tranſactions of Titus, as alſo of many tranſactions of St. Paul, which took place in this interval. When St. Luke again joined company with St. Paul, Titus does not appear to have been with him, ſo that theſe two Gentile converts attended perhaps the Apoſtle alternately. The third and laſt time, that we find Titus with St. Paul, was ſhortly before the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written, in which St. Paul ſays ch. iv. 10. that Titus was departed for Dalmatia. But this paſſage is of little importance in determining the date of the Epiſtle to Titus, which was certainly written long before the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy. This queſtion, which will be examined in the following ſection, muſt be determined by the paſſages above quoted.

SECT. II.

When and where the Epiſtle to Titus was written.

CHRISTIANITY had been very early planted in Crete, though we are not certain by whom it was firſt introduced there: but as ſeveral Cretans were preſent in Jeruſalem on the day of Pentecoſt, at the firſt effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt[i], it is not improbable that on their return they made known the Chriſtian religion. The only inſtance, in which St. Luke has made any mention

[f] 2 Cor. ii. 12. 13. [g] Ch. vii. 6. 13.

[h] See Vol. III. Ch. vi. Sect. 3. of this Introduction. [i] Acts ii. 11.

mention of a voyage of St. Paul to Crete is in Acts xxvii. 7. 8. But at that time St. Paul was on his voyage, as a priſoner, to Italy, and ſeems ouly to have touched at the iſland. It is true that St. Paul expreſſed to the Roman Centurion a wiſh to paſs the winter there: but St. Luke has not mentioned that he went on ſhore, nor is it probable that the Roman centurion would have given him permiſſion, as he was then a priſoner. With *this* voyage therefore of St. Paul to Crete the Epiſtle to Titus has no connexion.

But that St. Paul not only had been in the iſland of Crete, but had preached the Goſpel there, not long before he wrote his Epiſtle to Titus, is evident from its contents: for St. Paul ſays, ch. i. 5. 'For this cauſe left I thee in Crete, that thou ſhouldeſt ſet in order the things, that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.' Now as St. Luke has taken no notice in the Acts of the Apoſtles of the voyage undertaken by St. Paul to Crete, when he appointed Titus to ordain elders, we have no other means of determining the time when it happened, than a compariſon of the facts mentioned in the Epiſtle to Titus with what we know in general of St. Paul's travels. It is on this account, that commentators are ſo much at variance in reſpect to the date of this Epiſtle: and I myſelf entertain at preſent a very different opinion from that, which I formerly entertained. In the firſt edition of this Introduction, I deſcribed the Epiſtle to Titus, as written after St. Paul's impriſonment at Rome: in the ſecond edition I wavered in this opinion: when I publiſhed the third edition, I thought it highly probable that this Epiſtle was written long before St. Paul's voyage as a priſoner to Italy: and at preſent I have no doubt that it really was, and that in the chronological arrangement of St. Paul's Epiſtles it ſhould be placed between the ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians and the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians.

St. Paul ſays to Titus, ch. iii. 12. 'When I ſhall ſend Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus, be diligent to come unto

unto me to Nicopolis: for I have determined there to winter.' Now from this paſſage, if we knew what Nicopolis St. Paul meant, and when he was there, the date of this Epiſtle would be at once decided. For St. Paul muſt have been either in Nicopolis, or in the neighbourhood of the place, when he wrote this Epiſtle, becauſe, as there were many cities of this name, it would have been totally uſeleſs to have deſired Titus to come to him to Nicopolis, unleſs the place, where he wrote the Epiſtle had determined what Nicopolis he meant.

The queſtion therefore to be aſked is: In what country did this Nicopolis lie? The Greek ſubſcription to the Epiſtle is, Εγραφη απο Νικοπολεως της Μακεδονιας. But this is certainly a miſtake: for by Nicopolis in Macedonia, is meant the Nicopolis which was ſituate on the river Neſſus, was diſtinguiſhed from other cities of this name by the title Nicopolis ad Neſſum, and belonged in fact to Thrace. But this city was built by the Emperor Trajan, and conſequently did not exiſt in the time of St. Paul [k].

Further, when St. Paul wrote the Epiſtle to Titus, he was juſt returned from a voyage: and therefore the Nicopolis, where he wrote, could not have been at a conſiderable diſtance from the ſea. Hence it appears, that neither Nicopolis ad Hæmum [l], nor Nicopolis ad Iſtrum [m], could have been the place where he wrote, though the latter is underſtood by Theophylact [n]. Still leſs, could the Nicopolis in Armenia, or any other city of this name, in the middle of Aſia Minor. Nor could St. Paul mean the Nicopolis, which was ſituate in Egypt, not far from Alexandria [o]; for, as it was contrary to St. Paul's cuſtom to ſpend a conſiderable time in a ſmall town, which would have circumſcribed the propagation of

[k] See Mill's Note on the ſubſcription to this Epiſtle.

[l] Cellarii Geograph. Tom. I. p. 1327.

[m] Ib. p. 583.

[n] In his Note to Tit. iii. 12. he ſays, Η δε Νικοπολις της Θρακης εστι, τω Ιστρω επικειμενη.

[o] Cellarii Africa, p. 14.

of the Goſpel, he would have paſſed the winter at Alexandria, if he had been in Egypt, rather than at a ſmall town in its neighbourhood.

Of all the cities, which bore the name of Nicopolis, the moſt celebrated is that which lay in Epire, oppoſite to the promontory of Actium, and was built by Auguſtus in honour of his victory over Antony. This is the Nicopolis, which in my opinion St. Paul meant. But there were two other cities of this name, the one in Bithynia[p], the other in Cilicia[q], which were not inconveniently ſituated, if St. Paul ſet ſail from Epheſus, when he went into Crete, and returned from Crete into Aſia Minor: and therefore theſe two cities muſt not be paſſed over in the preſent inquiry.

Before I proceed, I muſt obſerve, that St. Luke, in the Acts of the Apoſtles, is equally ſilent in reſpect to St. Paul's viſit to Nicopolis, as on his voyage to Crete. For this reaſon many commentators have ſuppoſed, that both the one and the other happened at a period ſubſequent to the cloſe of St. Luke's hiſtory, and conſequently after the end of St. Paul's impriſonment in Rome. To this opinion however Lardner has made the following objection[r], which I do not think of ſufficient weight to overturn it, though I do not defend the opinion itſelf. Namely he objects, that St. Paul, after he was releaſed from his impriſonment in Rome, had attained too great an age to be able to undertake any new work, and that after that period he probably confined himſelf to the edification of thoſe churches, which he had already eſtabliſhed. But to this objection it may be replied, that if St. Paul was able to travel into countries, where he had already preached the Goſpel, he was equally able to travel into countries where he had not preached the Goſpel: and that, though greater exertions are requiſite to convert heathens to Chriſtianity, than to confirm in the faith thoſe who are already Chriſtians, yet, as St. Paul was endued with the power

[p] Cellarii Geograph. Tom. II. p. 308. [q] Ib. p. 260.

[r] Supplement, Vol. II. p. 168.

power of working miracles, the deficiency of natural vigour in an advanced ſtate of life might have been ſupplied by his ſupernatural endowments. A more important objection might be made from the circumſtance, that the interval, between St. Paul's releaſe from his firſt impriſonment in Rome and the commencement of his ſecond impriſonment, was too ſhort to admit of this voyage. St. Paul was probably releaſed from his firſt impriſonment, about the beginning of the year 65[a]; in the year 66, he was beheaded, and he was already returned to Rome ſome time before the winter, at leaſt in the month of Auguſt. Now in this interval he is ſaid to have travelled to Philippi, into Aſia Minor, to Coloſſæ, and even to Jeruſalem. There is hardly any time left therefore for a voyage into Crete; eſpecially as St. Paul was already returned from that iſland before the winter, that is, according to this hypotheſis, the winter of 65, which he intended to paſs at Nicopolis, as he himſelf ſays in the Epiſtle to Titus, ch. iii. 12. I admit however that this objection will loſe a part of its weight, if St. Paul's martyrdom, the time of which has never been fixed with chronological accuracy, took place one or two years later than the year which is uſually aſſigned.

But, in reſpect to the main point, I accede to the opinion of Lardner, and of thoſe writers whom he has quoted in ſupport of it: and I ſee at preſent no neceſſity for referring St. Paul's voyage to Crete to a period ſubſequent to the cloſe of the Acts of the Apoſtles, merely becauſe St. Luke has paſſed it over in ſilence. For it is certain that St. Paul undertook ſeveral voyages, previous to the laſt voyage deſcribed by St. Luke, as appears from what St. Paul himſelf ſays in his ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians, which was written ſoon after his departure from Epheſus mentioned Acts xx. 1. In this Epiſtle, ch. xi. 25. he tells the Corinthians, that he had thrice ſuffered ſhipwreck: of which St. Luke has given no account in his narrative. Now it is not improbable, that one

[a] See Ch. xxi. Sect. 2.

one of the voyages was the voyage made by St. Paul to Crete. I have already ſhewn that St. Luke was abſent from St. Paul during the whole of that period, which extends from Acts xvii. 1. to ch. xx. 6. in which interval he has omitted ſeveral important facts, to which St. Paul alludes in his Epiſtles. Among theſe facts may not improbably be reckoned St. Paul's voyage to Crete, and his ſubſequent viſit to Nicopolis. When the Apoſtle came to Corinth the ſecond time, and there wrote his Epiſtle to the Romans, he muſt have already preached the Goſpel in Epire: for he ſays in this Epiſtle, ch. xv. 19. 'round about unto Illyricum I have fully preached the Goſpel of Chriſt.' Since therefore it appears from the Epiſtle to Titus, that when St. Paul wrote to Titus, his intention was to paſs the winter in Nicopolis, we may not unreaſonably ſuppoſe, that this was the winter, in which he propagated Chriſtianity throughout Epire and Illyricum.

I therefore not only abandon the opinion, that the Epiſtle to Titus was written after St. Paul's impriſonment in Rome, in conformity with the ſentiments of Lardner and other eminent critics, but I venture to go even a ſtep further, and to place it in point of time before the ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians, becauſe in this laſt-mentioned Epiſtle St. Paul alludes to ſeveral voyages, which are omitted by St. Luke. That the reader may be enabled to judge of the probability or improbability of this aſſertion, I will ſtate the paſſages in that period of St. Paul's life, when St. Luke was abſent from him, to which we may refer the Apoſtle's voyage to Crete, and the winter, which on his return from that Iſland he paſſed in Nicopolis, without violating the order of St. Luke's narrative. Theſe paſſages are three in number, namely:

1. St. Paul ſpent a year and a half at Corinth, Acts xviii. 11. From this place he might have made an excurſion to Crete, for we muſt not ſuppoſe that he ſpent the whole of this period, without once having quitted Corinth. St. Paul, in like manner is ſaid to have reſided

three years at Epheſus; but if we underſtand this, as well as his eighteen months reſidence at Corinth, as implying that four years and a half were devoted to thoſe two cities alone, St. Paul's aſſertion, 2 Cor. xi. 25. that he had thrice ſuffered ſhipwreck, when he wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians, will be irreconcileable with St. Luke's narrative. And that St. Paul really did make an excurſion from Corinth during the interval in queſtion, and came therefore in fact a ſecond time thither before its expiration appears from what he himſelf ſays, 2 Cor. xii. 14. xiii. 1. where he ſpeaks of his intention of viſiting Corinth a third time, which is what we generally call his ſecond viſit to Corinth.

If then it be admitted that St. Paul's voyage to Crete was made from Corinth, the Nicopolis, where he paſſed the winter, and where he expected Titus, was certainly Nicopolis in Epire. It is true that, in returning from Crete to Corinth, Epire lay quite out of his way: but he might have been driven thither in a ſtorm, and perhaps at this very time he ſuffered one of the three ſhipwrecks[t], which he mentions in his ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians. In this caſe he would have paſſed the winter at Nicopolis, and have preached the Goſpel, as he himſelf ſays, round about to Illyricum. The circumſtance likewiſe, that Apollos took part in the converſion of the Cretans agrees extremely well with this hypotheſis: for Apollos appears to have come from Epheſus to Corinth, before St. Paul left that city on his firſt viſit. See Acts xviii. 24—xix. 1.

The moſt probable hypotheſis therefore, in my opinion, is that St. Paul's voyage to Crete, his ſubſequent ſtay in Nicopolis, and the Epiſtle to Titus, all belong to this period.

2. St. Paul paſſed three years at Epheſus, as we find from Acts xix. and xx. 31. In this interval therefore he might conveniently have made an excurſion to Crete. But, if the excurſion was made from Epheſus, the Nicopolis,

[t] Every one knows what Horace ſays of the Infames ſcopulos Acroceraunia.

polis, where he paſſed the winter, muſt be ſought, not in Epire, but in Aſia Minor; and the Nicopolis in Cilicia muſt be preferred to that in Bithynia. For whoever ſets ſail from Crete, to return to Epheſus, can hardly be driven by adverſe winds ſo far as into the Black Sea, and land at Nicopolis in Bithynia. The circumſtance, that Apollos aſſiſted St. Paul in converting the Cretans, is favourable alſo to the opinion that the voyage to Crete was made in an excurſion from Epheſus: for it appears from 1 Cor. xvi. 12. that Apollos was then returned from Corinth to Epheſus. However, I think it very improbable, that St. Paul would have paſſed a whole winter at Nicopolis in Cilicia; for, ſince his zeal for the propagation of Chriſtianity induced him in general to prefer large towns, as affording him a more ample ſcene of action, he would rather have ſpent the winter in Tarſus, which was both the capital of the country, and the place of his birth. A further confutation of this hypotheſis is unneceſſary at preſent: for, though I have mentioned it, as a poſſible one, I know of no commentator, who has adopted it.

3. Lardner is of opinion that between St. Paul's departure from Epheſus mentioned Acts xx. 1. and his laſt viſit to Jeruſalem a longer time elapſed, than is generally ſuppoſed, namely, almoſt two years: and in this period Lardner fixes St. Paul's voyage to Crete[u]. But this hypotheſis is attended with inſuperable difficulties.

The leaſt important objection is, that Apollos, as far as we know, was then at Epheſus[x]. But, when St. Paul wrote his Epiſtle to Titus, Apollos was in Crete, as appears from ch. iii. 13., and therefore muſt either have accompanied St. Paul, or have been ſent thither from Nicopolis.

But the following objection is more deciſive. It is evident from 2 Cor. i. 8. 9. 10. that the ſecond Epiſtle to

[u] Supplement to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, Vol. II. p. 101—118. 187—191.

[x] See 1 Cor. xvi. 12.

to the Corinthians was written very ſoon after St. Paul's departure from Epheſus: ſo that it is impoſſible to refer to this very ſhort interval St. Paul's voyage to Crete, and his reſidence in Nicopolis. Nor could he have lately ſuffered ſhipwreck, when he wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians: for the misfortune the moſt freſh in his memory was the diſturbance at Epheſus, which had obliged him to quit the place. Further, it is evident from what St. Paul ſays in the eighth and ninth chapters of this Epiſtle in reſpect to contributions for the poor, that after his departure from Epheſus he had viſited only the Macedonian churches. If then his voyage to Crete, and his ſubſequent ſtay in Nicopolis are to be referred to Acts xx. 1—5. they muſt have taken place, after he wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians. But in this caſe, neither of the three ſhipwrecks, which St. Paul mentions, 2 Cor. xi. 25. can have happened on the voyage either to or from Crete; and then we ſhall have five voyages made by St. Paul and omitted by St. Luke, whereas according to the firſt opinion not only the number will be confined to three, but what St. Paul ſays, 2 Cor. xi. 25. will harmonize with, and explain what he ſays, Tit. i. 3.

Laſtly, if we read with attention Acts xx. 1—6. we ſhall find it impoſſible to inſert in this interval a voyage to Crete and a reſidence during a whole winter in Nicopolis, which together muſt have taken up at leaſt eight months. For, as it was not uſual in that age to undertake a voyage after the month of September, St. Paul's return from Crete muſt have happened at leaſt before the cloſe of September: and if we make his ſtay in Crete as ſhort as poſſible, we muſt allow at leaſt that his voyage to Crete was not later, than the beginning of Auguſt. Before therefore his winter reſidence in Nicopolis was finiſhed, an interval of at leaſt eight months muſt have elapſed. Now let us keep this in view, and follow St. Luke's narrative, Acts xx. 1—6.

Ver. 1. St. Paul leaves Epheſus, ſoon after Eaſter, and travels into Macedonia. In his journey from Epheſus

to Macedonia, no one will ſuppoſe, that he went by the way of Crete and Nicopolis, and, after having paſſed a whole winter in Nicopolis, arrived the next year in Macedonia. This would have been a very extraordinary circuit. Beſides, if St. Paul had made this circuit, he would have viſited Corinth before his arrival in Macedonia: but his ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians, which was written in Macedonia, clearly ſhews, that he was then lately come from Aſia Minor. This objection did not occur to Lardner, becauſe he miſtakenly ſuppoſed that Nicopolis, where St. Paul paſſed the winter, was Nicopolis in Macedonia.

Ver. 2. St. Paul travels from Macedonia to Greece, and in particular to Corinth. To this journey the circuit of Crete and Nicopolis is likewiſe unſuitable. In Greece he ſtayed three months, ver. 3. which is much too ſhort a time for an excurſion to Crete and Nicopolis. When he returned from Greece, ver. 3. 4. St. Luke expreſsly ſays that he avoided going by ſea, and that he again went through Macedonia, whence he embarked for Troas. Here again he could not have taken Crete in his way. Laſtly, the voyage from Troas to Paleſtine is deſcribed ſo very circumſtantially by St. Luke, that no one will venture to ſuppoſe in this voyage a viſit to the iſland of Crete.

Of the three opinions therefore, in reſpect to the time when St. Paul made a voyage to Crete, the firſt is certainly the moſt eligible, and I believe the true one.

SECT. III.

Of the Jews in Crete.

ST. PAUL's principal adverſaries in Crete were Jews[y]. That they were very numerous in that iſland appears from the Epiſtle to Titus: but of their peculiar

[y] See Ch. I. ver. 14.

peculiar ſituation and circumſtances at that time we have no certain accounts. Some centuries later, namely in the year 434, we know that the Cretan Jews became celebrated for their falſe Meſſiah [z]: but on the circumſtances, which might tend to illuſtrate the Epiſtle to Titus, hiſtory is ſilent.

Perhaps however a part of what St. Paul ſays, 2 Cor. xi. 24. 'Of the Jews five times received I forty ſtripes ſave one,' was inflicted on him by the Jews in Crete. It appears from Tit. iii. 9. that they not only engaged in various controverſies reſpecting the Levitical law, which St. Paul declared to be aboliſhed, but introduced uſeleſs genealogies into their theology. Of what particular kind theſe genealogies were, I am unable to determine: but perhaps they were not unlike to what we find in the Targum on the books of the Chronicles, publiſhed by Beck and Wilkens, in which Anani, mentioned 1 Chron. iii. 24. is converted into the Meſſiah.

We ſee from ch. iii. 13. that Apollos aſſiſted Titus in the inſtruction of the Cretans. Now as Titus was by birth a heathen, it is probable that Apollos was joined with him in the miniſtry, as being an eloquent interpreter of the law, with which Titus could not have been acquainted.

In none of his Epiſtles does St. Paul ſpeak in ſuch ſevere terms, as in his Epiſtle to Titus, of the Cretans, c. ii. 12—16. It is true that he uſes the words of their own poet Epimenides, in deſcribing their falſity: but the very application implies that he thought the deſcription juſt, and that it was warranted by the actual ſtate of the Cretans, eſpecially of the Cretan Jews.

[z] Baſnage Hiſt. des Juifs. Liv. VI. Ch. xv. p. 1281.

CHAP. XIV.

OF THE TWO EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

SECT. I.

Of the city of Corinth: and when, and to whom, St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians.

THE two Epiſtles to the Corinthians appear to have been written about five or ſix years after St. Paul's ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, which was written at Corinth, while the Apoſtle was engaged in eſtabliſhing a Chriſtian community in that city. At Corinth he reſided a year and a half[a]; at the expiration of which period he took a journey into Aſia[b], viſited Epheſus, Jeruſalem and Antioch[c], and then paſſing through Galatia and Phrygia returned to Epheſus[d], where he remained three years[e]. During this reſidence at Epheſus, and toward the cloſe of it, St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, as appears from ch. xvi. 8. where he ſays, 'I will tarry at Epheſus until Pentecoſt.' Further, that it was written at the Eaſter preceding this Pentecoſt appears from the expreſſion uſed by St. Paul, ch. v. 7. 'ye are unleavened,' that is, ye are now celebrating the feaſt of unleavened bread. Now St. Paul's departure from Epheſus after his reſidence of three years there, was about the year of Chriſt 57: conſequently, about that time was written that Epiſtle to the Corinthians, which is the firſt of thoſe, which are now extant. In the ſubſcriptions to this Epiſtle it is ſaid to have been written from Philippi, contrary to St. Paul's own declaration, which I have juſt quoted. This miſtake aroſe probably from a falſe interpretation of ch. xvi. 5. where the

[a] Acts xviii. 1. 11. [b] Ver. 18. [c] Ver. 20—22.
[d] Ch. xix. 1. [e] Ch. xx. 31.

the Apoſtle ſays, Μακεδονιαν γαρ διερχομαι, which was underſtood as denoting, 'I am *now* travelling through Macedonia,' though it evidently denotes nothing more than 'my route is through Macedonia.'

The city of Corinth was ſituated in Achaia, near the Iſthmus, which joins Peloponneſus with the reſt of Greece. It had two harbours, which opened to the two neighbouring ſeas, one of them convenient for the Aſiatic, the other for the Italian trade. This ſituation contributed greatly to the wealth of the city: and though the Roman general Mummius had levelled it to the ground, yet it roſe again, and gradually arrived at ſuch a height of grandeur, as to be entitled to the appellation of the Capital of Greece. Julius Cæſar had greatly contributed to its reſtoration, and had ſent thither Roman colonies. Near this city were celebrated the Iſthmian games: and on this account St. Paul has many alluſions to theſe games in his two Epiſtles to the Corinthians.

Theſe Epiſtles were addreſſed, not only to the inhabitants of Corinth, but likewiſe to the Chriſtian communities throughout all Achaia, as appears from the beginning of the ſecond Epiſtle. There is a paſſage in the firſt Epiſtle, ch. i. 2. from which one might almoſt conclude that St. Paul's intention was, that they who conveyed this Epiſtle to Corinth, ſhould in their paſſage ſhew it to other communities. But an objection to this conjecture is, that St. Paul in many parts of this Epiſtle ſeverely reproaches the Corinthians. To have ſhewn it therefore to other communities would unavoidably have provoked the Corinthians, which would have been neither conſiſtent with St. Paul's general caution, nor with the profeſſions, which he ſoon after made in his ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians[f]. I believe therefore that the paſſage in queſtion, 1 Cor. i. 2. τη εκκλησια τυ Θευ τη ουση εν Κορινθῳ, ηγιασμενοις εν Χριστῳ Ιησυ, κλητοις ἁγιοις, συν πασι τοις επικαλυμενοις το ονομα τυ Κυριυ ημων Ιησυ Χριστυ εν παντι τοπῳ, αυτων τε και ημων, relates, not to the Corinthians,

Corinthians, and to other Chriſtian communities in places diſtinct from Corinth, but to Chriſtians of two different deſcriptions in Corinth itſelf, which may be called, according to our preſent modes of expreſſion, church-men and diſſenters. I underſtand therefore the Apoſtle as ſaying, 'to the Church of God in Corinth, together with all thoſe who call on the name of Chriſt, whether they aſſemble in our place of worſhip, or in their own.' Ἅγιοι in the language of the New Teſtament denotes Chriſtians in general; and, as the Corinthian community was divided into parties, St. Paul diſtinguiſhes from the ſeparatiſts, thoſe who aſſembled in the uſual place of worſhip, by the title of κλητοι. This expreſſion is borrowed from the Septuagint, in which κλητη ἁγια the tranſlation of מקרא קדש, denotes a congregation called together for divine worſhip. The diſſenting party at Corinth, which met at their own place of worſhip, the Apoſtle mentions in terms of gentleneſs, and includes under the general appellation of 'thoſe who call on the name of Chriſt.' The preceding explanation has likewiſe this advantage, that it ſhews St. Paul has not made uſe of ſuperfluous expreſſions, and repeated only in different words at the end of the verſe what he had ſaid at the beginning.

SECT. II.

The ſtate of the Chriſtian community in Corinth deſcribed.

AS the ſituation of the Chriſtian community in Corinth was very remarkable, a knowledge of it will greatly contribute to the illuſtration of St. Paul's two Epiſtles to the Corinthians. I will therefore enumerate the moſt material circumſtances attending this church, which at the ſame time will throw a light on the other Epiſtles, becauſe in theſe two St. Paul is very minute in reſpect to the regulation of divine worſhip.

1. The

1. The Corinthian community conſiſted, like moſt others, partly of Jews and partly of Heathens[g]: and hence St. Paul had to combat, ſometimes with Jewiſh ſuperſtition, at other times with heathen licentiouſneſs. Among the Jewiſh converts was Criſpus, a man of no leſs rank than that of preſident of a ſynagogue[h]. Whether he continued in his office, after he was become a Chriſtian, is a queſtion which at preſent we cannot decide. That he did continue is a matter not impoſſible, becauſe Chriſtianity was conſidered at that time as a Jewiſh ſect, and the ſynagogues were open even to the Apoſtles.

2. The Chriſtian communities in general, during the Apoſtolic age, were of a mixed kind: and they contained both hypocrites and profligates. This may be eſpecially affirmed of the Corinthian community[i]: and we may form ſome notion of their conduct from the circumſtance, that they came not ſeldom intoxicated to the celebration of the holy ſacrament[k].

3. The church of Corinth had ſeveral eminent teachers, beſide St. Paul. Criſpus, one of its members, had been preſident of a Jewiſh ſynagogue. Aquilas, with whom St. Paul reſided at Corinth * inſtructed in Chriſtianity a perſon, who afterwards became one of the moſt celebrated teachers[l]; and he is repreſented by St. Paul as one of his principal aſſiſtants, as having merited the greateſt confidence. Apollos, a learned and eloquent Jew, ſpent likewiſe ſome time at Corinth[m]: and he appears to have ſtood in high eſtimation among the Corinthians. Softhenes alſo muſt have been a man of great repute in the Corinthian church: for the firſt Epiſtle is written in the name of Paul and Softhenes[n], as the ſecond is written in the name of Paul and Timothy.

[g] Acts xviii. 4. [h] Ver. 8. [i] 2 Cor. xii. 20. 21.
[k] 1 Cor. xi. 21. * Acts xviii. 3. [l] Acts xviii. 26.
[m] V. 24—28.
[n] 1 Cor. i. 1. I have already obſerved Ch. x. Sect. 1. that as St. Paul uſually dictated his Epiſtles, he ſometimes added the name of his amanuenſis to his own name, and wrote therefore in their joint names.

thy [o]. It is difficult to determine who *this* Soſthenes was, for among thoſe who attended St. Paul on his travels, no perſon occurs with this name. Many commentators have ſuppoſed him to have been the ſame, as the Soſthenes mentioned in Acts xviii. 17. and there deſcribed as preſident of a Jewiſh ſynagogue: but of their identity we have no proof [p]. When St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, Soſthenes, Apollos, and Aquilas, were with him at Epheſus [q]. Apollos ſeems to have left Corinth even in diſguſt: at leaſt he declined returning thither, when this Epiſtle was ſent [r].

4. In the Corinthian community ſeveral ſects had ariſen, who took their names from their leaders, whom they blindly followed and whoſe learning and eloquence they highly extolled [s]. Theſe heads of the Corinthian parties

[o] 2 Cor. i. 1.

[p] The only argument which can be alleged is, that both were called Soſthenes. But as different perſons may have the ſame name, this argument proves nothing. On the contrary, there is reaſon to believe, that they were different perſons. For, the Soſthenes, in whoſe name the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians was written, was undoubtedly a Chriſtian: whereas the Soſthenes, mentioned Acts xviii. 17. was not only a Jew, but one of St. Paul's bittereſt accuſers before Gallio. It is true that he might have been afterwards converted to Chriſtianity: but this is not probable, for St. Luke not only ſays nothing of his converſion, but relates that his accuſation of St. Paul, and the public inſult, to which he was in conſequence expoſed, happened only a few days before the Apoſtle left Corinth. Further, the Soſthenes, in whoſe name the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians was written, muſt have been with St. Paul, when he dictated that Epiſtle, that is, at Epheſus: but the Soſthenes, who was preſident of a Jewiſh ſynagogue at Corinth, remained there, when St. Paul left that city. At leaſt he is not mentioned, Acts xviii. 18. among thoſe who accompanied the Apoſtle.

Dr. Hoven, in a Corollary annexed to his diſſertation, De Chriſtianorum ſæculi primi vita et moribus, aſſerts that Soſthenes and Criſpus were one and the ſame perſon. But, as St. Paul names Soſthenes, 1 Cor. i. 1. and mentions Criſpus, ver. 14. of the ſame chapter, it is evident that they were different perſons: for he would ſurely not have created an unneceſſary confuſion, in mentioning in ſo ſhort a compaſs the very ſame perſon under two different names.

[q] 1 Cor. i. 1. Acts xviii. 18.

[r] 1 Cor. xvi. 12.

[s] 1 Cor. i. 11. 12. From what St. Paul ſays V. 14—17. one might ſuppoſe that the leaders of theſe ſects baptized in their own name.

parties endeavoured to leſſen the character of St. Paul, and even to conteſt his apoſtolical authority: which obliged him to vindicate himſelf, and to ſpeak in his own commendation [s]. Sometimes they accuſed him of want of eloquence [t]: at other times, of having ſuppreſſed ſome of the moſt profound truths of Chriſtianity, and of having barely laid the foundation, on which they intended to build [u]. At one time they repreſented in an odious light St. Paul's refuſal to receive pay from the Corinthians, alleging that he was conſcious of not being a divine Apoſtle, and that his whole miſſion was a mere fraud [w]. At another time, they pretended that St. Paul, through diſtruſt of his cauſe, conducted himſelf humbly and even ſervilely, when preſent at Corinth: but, that in his abſence he wrote to them haughty and menacing letters [x]. Laſtly, the very ſufferings, which St. Paul endured for the ſake of Chriſt, were to theſe men a ſubject of complaint: for they aſſerted that St. Paul incurred them merely through impetuoſity and raſhneſs [y]. Perhaps this extraordinary objection was occaſioned by the Jewiſh maxim, 'that the ſpirit of prophecy reſts only upon eminent, happy, and cheerful men.'

Upon reading the three firſt chapters of the firſt Epiſtle one would be almoſt inclined to think, that theſe ſects had called themſelves after Paul, Peter, and Apollos: but the reſt of the Epiſtle ſhews that they were partiſans of an adverſary of the Apoſtle. Beſides St. Paul himſelf ch. iv. 6. ſays that he uſed his own name and thoſe of his friends by way of inſtances, in order to avoid the mentioning of his adverſaries by name, and thus expoſing them to public diſgrace.

Locke has advanced the probable conjecture, that the party againſt St. Paul had only one leader. This at leaſt

[s] 1 Cor. ii. ix. 2 Cor. x. xi.

[t] I requeſt the reader to examine what I have written in the Curæ in Actus Apoſtolorum Syriacos, § 1, on Acts xviii. 5. 6.

[u] 1 Cor. iii. [w] 1 Cor. ix.

[x] 2 Cor. x. 1. 2. 10. 11. [y] 1 Cor. iv. 8—14.

leaſt is certain that the Apoſtle ſpeaks ſeveral times in the ſingular number, eſpecially in 2 Cor. x. 10. 11: and where he has uſed the plural, he was influenced perhaps by motives of delicacy, and an unwillingneſs to bear too hard on a ſingle perſon. In the ſecond Epiſtle, ch. x. 2. he ſpeaks in the plural number, and uſes τινες, which ſhews that he meant certain perſons in particular: and from ver. 6. it appears that he oppoſed theſe perſons to the majority of the Corinthians. In ver. 7. he uſes τις in the ſingular number, and ſays, 'If any man truſts to himſelf that he is Chriſt's, let him of himſelf, &c.' Ver. 10. he ſays expreſsly φησι, and ver. 11. he is ſtill more perſonal and determinate, making uſe of τοιουτος, a term, which he has elſewhere applied to the perſon who was guilty of inceſt, and which to thoſe who underſtood St. Paul's meaning, was as intelligible as the name itſelf would have been. The expreſſion which he has uſed, ch. xi. 4. ὁ ερχομενος is ſtill more particular, and could not fail to point out to the Corinthians the perſon whom the Apoſtle had in view. In ch. x. 12. xi. 13. 14. 15. the plural number is again uſed: but in ver. 30. the plural is again changed for the ſingular.

It appears from 2 Cor. xi. 22. that St. Paul's principal adverſary was a Jew, who valued himſelf on this privilege: and hence we may explain the affair of the inceſtuous marriage, which was vindicated by St. Paul's adverſary, and which none but a Jew could vindicate. From 2 Cor. v. 16. 17. x. 6. 8. one might almoſt ſuppoſe that he was either a relation of Chriſt, or was perſonally acquainted with him, or at leaſt pretended to be ſo. His arrogant pretenſions, and the commendations which both he and his party beſtowed on themſelves, are repreſented by St. Paul in very lively colours. From 2 Cor. xi. 1—4. 13. 14. we muſt conclude that he was a man of infamous character, who endeavoured to counteract the propagation of Chriſtianity: and I cannot ſuppoſe that he was any other, than the perſon, with whom St. Paul had principally to combat, in regard to the doctrine of the reſurrection of the dead. I much doubt whether

he

he believed at all in the Chriſtian religion: for though, through motives of intereſt, he pretended to teach it, he might ſtill have had ſecret deſigns to undermine it. If this be true, St. Paul probably alluded to him, 1 Cor. xvi. 22. where he ſays, Ει τις ου φιλει τον Κυριον Ιησουν Χριστον, ητω αναθεμα. To ſay this of a perſon, who merely had no love for Chriſt, would be too ſevere: for mere want of love may ariſe from a want of knowledge. Nor has St. Paul ever ſpoken in ſuch hard terms, either of Herod, or of the Roman governors of Judæa, though they certainly did not love Chriſt. Ου φιλει, therefore is here applicable, not to one, who has ſimply want of love; but to one, who has actual hatred of Chriſt, and who perſecutes his religion, ſuch as St. Paul's principal adverſary at Corinth. The very place likewiſe, in which this paſſage is introduced, ſhews that St. Paul alluded to a particular adverſary: for it is added immediately after the ſalutations to the brethren.

In the ſecond Epiſtle, ch. xi. 4. is a remarkable paſſage, in which St. Paul ſays, 'If he that cometh preacheth another Jeſus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another ſpirit, which ye have not received, &c.' Perhaps therefore St. Paul's adverſary pretended to be poſſeſſed of the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt: and it is not improbable that, in order to ſeduce the Corinthians, he undertook ſimilar facts and operations to thoſe, which we have ſeen lately exhibited by Caglioſtro and his aſſociates.

I formerly ſuppoſed that Criſpus, mentioned Acts xviii. 8. was St. Paul's principal adverſary. But this ſuppoſition is without foundation: for St. Paul's principal adverſary at Corinth was not originally an inhabitant of the place, but a ſtranger, who came thither after the foundation of the Chriſtian church there. This appears from 2 Cor. xi. 4. where he is called ὁ ερχομενος: and the Apoſtle probably alludes to him 2 Cor. iii. 1. where ſpeaking of recommendatory letters, he ſays, that he ſtood not in need of them, as

ſome did. But if Criſpus was not St. Paul's principal adverſary, he may have been *one* of thoſe, who oppoſed the deſigns of the Apoſtle. Among the eminent teachers above-mentioned, Criſpus was the only one, who ſtill remained in Corinth: and whoever ventured to oppoſe himſelf to St. Paul muſt be ſuppoſed to have been a man of ſome eminence. Now it was St. Paul's uſual practice to ſalute by name all thoſe, who particularly diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the community to which he was writing: but though Criſpus was one of the few, which the Apoſtle himſelf had baptized, though he had occupied the eminent ſtation of preſident of a ſynagogue, and moreover was one of the earlieſt converts to Chriſtianity at Corinth, St. Paul not only ſends no ſalutation to Criſpus at the end of this Epiſtle, but particularly directs the attention of the Corinthians to the family of Stephanas[a]. St. Paul's rejoicing, that he had baptized none but Criſpus and Gaius, ſeems ſtrangely placed in 1 Cor. i. 14, 15. For who would directly accuſe him of having baptized in his own name and not in that of Chriſt? Perhaps he only intended to remind Criſpus in an indirect manner, that he was his immediate diſciple, and had been baptized by him. An objection to the ſuppoſition, that Criſpus was one of St. Paul's adverſaries may be made from the circumſtance, that his name is mentioned in only two inſtances, in the whole New Teſtament, that he is mentioned in neither place with the ſmalleſt mark of diſapprobation, and in one of them[b] even in terms of applauſe. Yet it is ſtill poſſible that he afterwards became an adverſary of St. Paul, though St. Luke has not mentioned it, eſpecially as St. Luke has in moſt caſes paſſed over the hiſtory of heretics in ſilence[c]. It is ſuppoſed by many that the Nicolaus, mentioned Acts vi. 5. was the founder of the heretical ſect of the Nicolaitans: yet St. Luke has mentioned

[a] 1 Cor. xvi. 15. [b] Acts xviii.

[c] See above, Ch. viii. Sect. 2.

mentioned him there as a Chriſtian proſelyte, and without giving the ſmalleſt hint, that he afterwards became a heretic of the firſt magnitude. It is therefore not impoſſible that Criſpus likewiſe became a heretic, though it is not mentioned in the Acts of the Apoſtles. St. Luke has in fact mentioned very few of St. Paul's adverſaries at Corinth, and of thoſe in particular, who denied the reſurrection of the dead, he has taken not the leaſt notice. Nor muſt we forget that St. Luke did not accompany St. Paul to Corinth, but ſtaid behind at Philippi: ſo that many material events might have taken place in the Corinthian community, which never came to his knowledge.

5. A marriage of the moſt abominable kind had taken place in the Corinthian community, and approved by its members, to the great offence of the heathens. Namely, a man had married his father's wife, that is, his own ſtep-mother. Some commentators, in order to aggravate the offence, pretend that the father was ſtill alive, and that either the ſon had committed adultery, or that the father had ſurrendered to him his wife. But as St. Paul has no where given the leaſt intimation, that the father was ſtill alive, this conjecture is without foundation: and therefore we muſt take the expreſſion 'father's wife' in the ſenſe in which it is uſed in the marriage laws of Moſes[a], where it denotes 'a dowager ſtep-mother.' They, who contend that the father was ſtill living, appeal to 2 Cor. vii. 12. on the ſuppoſition that he was 'the injured perſon' of whom St. Paul there ſpeaks. But St. Paul might mean himſelf, in the ſame manner as in ch. ii. 5. he called himſelf aggrieved by the inceſtuous perſon. Beſides, if the father had been alive when the ſon married, he muſt have given his conſent, and therefore no injury was done him. That he did not commit adultery againſt the will of the father, but that he was actually in poſſeſſion of the woman,

[a] Lev. xviii.

woman, as his wife, appears from the phraſe γυναικα εχειν.

According to the laws of the city of Corinth, this marriage would not have been permitted by the heathen magiſtrate. For though the Athenian laws permitted marriage with very near relations, yet as ſoon as Greece became a Roman province, the Roman laws were introduced, and by theſe a marriage with a ſtepmother was ſtrictly prohibited. For want of authorities I cannot ſtrictly determine what puniſhment was annexed to a marriage of this kind under the reign of Nero, when St. Paul wrote this Epiſtle. But in the time of Alexander Severus,[e] the puniſhment was Deportatio, or baniſhment to ſome deſolate iſland, when a man debauched a widow, who was too nearly related to him, to admit of a marriage with her. Marcian, who lived in the reign of Severus, ſays, Inſtitut. Lib. II. Si quis viduam—cognatum, cum qua nuptias contrahere non poteſt, corruperit, in inſulam deportandus eſt [e]. Hence we may judge how ſevere the laws would have been againſt a man, who married his own ſtepmother.

But how was it poſſible then under theſe circumſtances to contract ſuch a marriage at Corinth? It could have been done only under the alleged ſanction of the Jewiſh law. The Jews pretend that a proſelyte by baptiſm becomes a deſcendant of Abraham, and in ſo ſtrict a ſenſe, that all former relations immediately ceaſe. Hence they drew this concluſion, 'that a heathen was at liberty to marry his mother, or his own ſiſter, as ſoon as ſhe was regenerate by baptiſm [f].' Now the Jews were at that time permitted to live according to their own laws [g]: and the Chriſtians were then conſidered as a Jewiſh ſect. In particular

[e] See the Digeſt. L. xlviii.; tit. 18. 5.

[f] See Maimonides in 'Iſſure Biah,' cap. iv. Selden de uxore Heb. Lib. II. cap. 18. and De jure nat. et gent. Lib. II. cap. 4.

[g] Joſeph. Antiq. Lib. xvi. 6. 1.

ticular the privilege of marrying according to their own cuſtoms, and without any regard to the Roman civil law, they retained till the time of Theodoſius, who deprived them of it in the ſtatute entitled De Judæis et Cælicolis[h] where we find the following clauſe, 'Nemo Judæorum morem ſuum in conjunctionibus retineat, nec juxta legem ſuam nuptias ſortiatur.' The inceſtuous marriage therefore, of which St. Paul complains, might be ſolemnized, to the great offence of the heathens, under the ſanction of Judaiſm or Chriſtianity. And the Corinthian community had approved it, probably becauſe the Jewiſh teacher, who oppoſed St. Paul, had defended it by arguing from the Jewiſh doctrines of baptiſm and regeneration.

6. It was uſual among the primitive Chriſtians, in imitation of the Jews, to appoint arbitrators, when one Chriſtian had a complaint againſt another. Vitringa, in his treatiſe De Synagoga vetere, Lib. III. P. i. c. 13. p. 816. has quoted a law of Arcadius and Honorius, by which the Jews were indeed forbidden to hold courts of judicature, but were permitted to have arbitrators elected with the conſent of both parties, whoſe deciſion the Roman magiſtrates were bound to ſupport and execute. 'Si qui vero ex his communi pactione ad ſimilitudinem arbitrorum apud Judæos in civili dumtaxat negotio putaverint litigandum, ſortiri eorum judicium jure publico non vetentur. Eorum etiam ſententias judices exequantur, tanquam ex ſententia cognitoris arbitri dati fuerint[i]. As the Jews poſſeſſed this privilege ſo long after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, we may conclude, that they enjoyed it before that time in ſtill greater extent. And this inference is confirmed by a much more ancient Reſcript of Lucius Antonius to the Sardinians, in which this privilege is repreſented as having been enjoyed by

[h] In the ſeventh book of the Theodoſian code.

[i] This law, which Vitringa has quoted inaccurately, is in Lib. I. Cod. tit. 9. leg. 8. de Judæis et Cælicolis.

by the Jews, and is further ſecured to them. The words of this Reſcript, as quoted by Joſephus[k], are as follows. 'The Jews have repreſented to me that they have had from the very beginning their own aſſembly[l] according to the cuſtom of their anceſtors, and their own place, where they ſettled diſputes among themſelves. As they have now requeſted that the ſame be further granted them, I determine that leave be given to them.' The Chriſtians, as being reckoned among the Jews, had a right to exerciſe the ſame privilege: ſo that the Apoſtles did not infringe the power of the magiſtrate, when they directed the Chriſtian communities to decide all civil conteſts among themſelves by Chriſtian arbitrators. But the Corinthian Chriſtians, to the diſgrace of their religion, brought their complaints before the heathen magiſtrate[m], probably with the view of injuring the perſon accuſed[n] either by the aid of ſome unjuſt laws, or by miſrepreſentation in the pleadings, which could not have been practiſed with ſucceſs before a Chriſtian arbitrator, who decided merely according to equity.

From the expreſſion uſed by St. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 1. 'Dare any of you,' we may conclude that the fault, which he cenſures in the Corinthians was new and unuſual It is probable therefore, that they were not Gentiles, but Jews, who, regardleſs of their own cuſtoms and privileges, had appealed to heathen judicatures.

7. In moſt other Chriſtian communities, there was a diſſenſion between the Jewiſh and Gentile converts, becauſe the former, though they had embraced Chriſtianity, ſtill adhered to the Levitical law. But the Corinthian community is an exception. It is true, that ſome weak brethren at Corinth ſcrupled to partake of meats, which had been offered to idols, as appears from 1 Cor. x. 24—30. But as St. Paul rather warns them

[k] Antiq. Lib. XIV. 10. 17.

[l] Συνοδος.

[m] 1 Cor. vi. 1.

[n] Ver. 8.

them againſt an abuſe of liberty, as will preſently appear, the majority of the Corinthian Chriſtians muſt have been free from the common prejudices of the Jews.

It could not be unlawful in itſelf to eat what had been offered to idols; for the conſecration of fleſh or of wine to an idol did not make it the property of the idol, an idol being in fact a non-entity, and incapable of property. This is the doctrine taught by St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 25. 26. 27. 29. 30. But ſome of the Corinthians, not ſatisfied with this liberty, thought it lawful to viſit the heathen temples, which were frequently places of riot and debauchery, and to partake of the offered ſacrifice, amidſt the praiſes which were ſung to the heathen gods[o]. This was an actual participation of the idolatry; and ſuch perſons were of courſe conſidered by the heathens as having joined in their worſhip. St. Paul therefore judged it neceſſary to warn the Corinthians againſt idolatry, which he has done eſpecially 1 Cor. x. 7. 2 Cor. vi. 14—17. Whether an act be a religious teſt, or not, depends on the circumſtances and place of its performance. If I eat a wafer in my room, it ſignifies nothing: but if I eat it before a Romiſh altar, I avow myſelf a member of the church of Rome.

The diſſolute liberty of ſome members of the Corinthian community went ſtill further. The majority of the heathen world conſidered the indulgence of ſenſual appetites as a matter in itſelf indifferent. Venus had a temple at Corinth, in which a thouſand women were kept, in honour of the goddeſs, and for the gratification of her adorers[p]. Some of the Corinthian Chriſtians were diſpoſed to join in this worſhip: and the maxim 'that all things were lawful[q],' which related only

[o] 1 Cor. viii. 10. x. 20. 21. 24.

[p] See Strabo, Lib. II. c. 10. and Moſheim's Expoſition of the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, p. 8—10.

[q] 1 Cor. vi. 12. 13.

only to clean and unclean meats, they extended likewiſe to fornication. St. Paul therefore judged it neceſſary to cenſure this vice, and to pronounce it unlawful. The ſame ſcandalous tenets had taken place at Pergamos, when St. John wrote the Apocalypſe, as appears from ch. ii. 14.

8. The public worſhip of the primitive Chriſtians was very different from our own. In our churches the miniſter only has a right to ſpeak and explain the ſcriptures: but in the primitive churches this privilege was not confined to a particular order, every one having a liberty to ſpeak in public, for general edification[r]. This regulation of the Chriſtian worſhip was, like other inſtitutions, originally derived from the Jewiſh ſynagogue, in which every one, who was qualified for the taſk, with the permiſſion of the preſident of the ſynagogue, might read and expound the law[s]. But as many of the primitive Chriſtians had received extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, it was their cuſtom to edify the congregation by ſpeaking alternately[t]. Some, who had received the gift of tongues, ſpake publickly in foreign languages, and by the exerciſe of this gift proved the divine origin of the Chriſtian religion[u]: others again expounded what theſe had delivered[w]. This had likewiſe ſome analogy to the cuſtom

[r] Altmann, in his Obſervationes in Epiſtolas ad Corinthios, p. 14, denies this; and quotes the inſtance of Alexander, who was blamed for permitting the celebrated Origen to ſpeak publickly in the church, before he was ordained prieſt. But we muſt not argue from the practice of the Chriſtian church in the time of Origen, to its practice in the time of the Apoſtles. Before the cloſe of the third century, the cuſtoms of the Chriſtian churches were materially altered, the authority of the clergy was increaſed, and the extraordinary gifts, with which even the illiterate laity were ſometimes endowed, had long ceaſed.

[s] Luke iv. 16. 17. Acts xiii. 15. 16. Vitringa de Syn. vet. Lib. III. cap. 7. p. 947.

[t] 1 Cor. xiv. [u] Ver. 1. 2. 4. 5. 13—19.

[w] Ver. 13.

cuſtom in the Jewiſh ſynagogues, of reading the law in the Hebrew, which was become a dead language, and of expounding it in the language underſtood by the congregation. Some propheſied [x], that is, they ſpake in a known language, at the inſtigation of the Holy Ghoſt: others endeavoured to explain their prophecies, and to determine the time pointed at by the ſpirit of Chriſt, which was in them [y]. Some prayed, as they were immediately inſpired by the ſpirit of God [z]. The Spirit which formerly animated David, when he celebrated in ſacred hymns the praiſes of his creator, taught them likewiſe to praiſe God in ſpiritual ſongs [a]. If any one of the congregation felt an impulſe from the Holy Ghoſt, to ſpeak in public, he was permitted, and the reſt were obliged to be ſilent while he ſpake [b]. In theſe caſes even a woman was allowed to ſpeak in public, as appears from 1 Cor. xi. 5. which at other times was prohibited [c]: for, when they ſpake by inſpiration, *they* were not properly the ſpeakers, but the Holy Ghoſt. If none of the congregation felt an impulſe from the Holy Ghoſt, then probably in imitation of the Jewiſh cuſtom, a portion of ſcripture was read accompanied with an expoſition and an exhortation [d]. What St. Paul has ſaid of prophecy in the Corinthian Church ſome commentators underſtand as denoting only an expoſition of Scripture. But this uſe of the word προφητεια has been hitherto ſhewn by no deciſive example: and as St. Paul has mentioned it among the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghoſt [e], I can ſee no reaſon for taking the word προφητεια, in St. Paul's Epiſtles to the Corinthians, in any other than its proper ſenſe.

The preceding paragraph contains only a ſummary view of the public worſhip eſtabliſhed in the primitive Church. Whoever wiſhes to have a more full and elaborate account of it, muſt conſult Dr. Benſon's Eſſay concerning

[x] Ver. 1. 6. 24. 26. [y] Ver. 29. [z] Ver. 15.
[a] Ver. 15. and Epheſ. v. 19. [b] 1 Cor. xiv. 30. 31.
[c] 1 Cor. xiv. 34. 35. [d] 1 Tim. iv. 13. [e] 1 Cor. xii. xiii. xiv.

concerning the ſettlement of the primitive Church, and the religious worſhip of the Chriſtians, whilſt the ſpiritual gifts continued,' which is annexed to his Expoſition of the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy.

9. Several abuſes in the conduct of public worſhip exiſted in the Corinthian Church:

The firſt of theſe conſiſted in an affectation of an unuſual dreſs and appearance; among perſons of both ſexes, when they propheſied in the church; which was of courſe offenſive to the Greeks. It appears from what Lucian has ſaid in his treatiſe De Gymnaſiis [f], that among the Greeks the men never appeared in public with their heads covered: but the Jews on the contrary in performing the public offices of the ſynagogue, ſuch as praying and reading the Bible, not only covered the head, but even veiled it. To this Jewiſh cuſtom St. Paul alludes 2 Cor. iii. 14. 15. and ſpeaks of it in a tone of ridicule, as being perhaps not univerſally received among the Jews, and a mere innovation. At preſent it is the univerſal cuſtom of the Jews, when they read the law in the ſynagogue, to put on a veil, which they call Tallith: and I have known conſcientious Jews, who would not even drink coffee, without firſt putting on their hats and praying in private. This cuſtom of veiling they probably borrowed from the Romans, who thought that every object, which preſented itſelf during the adminiſtration of religious ceremonies, was of great importance, and therefore took all poſſible care to avoid ſeeing at ſuch times whatever might be interpreted a bad omen. For this purpoſe they covered their faces, and ſome went even in a covered vehicle to the place of ſacrifice: for if the omen was not ſeen it was of no conſequence [g]. From the Romans the cuſtom of covering the face during religious ceremonies was tranſmitted to the

[f] Luciani Op. Tom. I. p. 736.

[g] Cicer. de Divinat. Lib. II. 36. More authorities are quoted by I. Caſimir Happach, in his Comment. de calumnia religioſa. Cap. iv. § 12.

the Jews[h]: and from the Jews it was transferred to the Chriſtians, who covered their heads whenever they ſpake in the public congregation. This gave the Chriſtian church a ridiculous appearance in the eyes of the Greeks; and it was at the ſame time a ſuperſtitious cuſtom, though the Jews and ſeveral Romans gave it a ſpecious interpretation, by ſaying that they covered their faces in reverence to the Deity whom they adored.

10. In the Eaſtern countries, the women are obliged to live extremely reſerved, and they reſide in the innermoſt part of the houſe, where no man is permitted to approach them: and whenever they go out, they are obliged to cover themſelves with a veil. Among the Greeks, the Spartans only excepted, the women led ſolitary lives in the Gynæconitæ, as Cornelius Nepos relates in his Preface: and when they went out, they likewiſe veiled themſelves. When a Greek woman married, the bridegroom had not a right to take off her veil till the day after the wedding, for which reaſon this day was called ἀναϰαλυπτηρια[i]. But they relaxed from this ſeverity at the feſtivals inſtituted in honour of their Deities, at which the Grecian women appeared with their faces uncovered: and this is the reaſon, that in the Greek comedies love generally begins in a temple.

Under theſe circumſtances, it was a diſgrace for Chriſtian women to uncover themſelves during the time of divine ſervice, and to preſent themſelves not only in a manner unuſual at other times, but like women of bad

[h] This has been ſhewn by Lakemacher, in his Obſervationes philologicæ, P. III. Obſ. 2. I muſt remark however one miſtake, which he has made in his interpretation of the two following lines of Virgil's Æneid, Lib. III. 406.

> Ne qua inter ſanctos ignes in honore Deorum
> *Hoſtilis facies* occurrat, et omina turbet.

By *hoſtilis facies* he underſtands 'the face or ſight of an enemy,' as of Diomedes or Ulyſſes, as he himſelf inſtances. But *hoſtilis* ſignifies here 'inauſpicious,' and is a very uſual expreſſion in Roman augury, as every one knows, who is acquainted with Cicero's books, de Divinatione.

[i] See this word in the Index to Hudſon's Longinus.

bad character among the Jews[k]. Yet the Chriſtian women at Corinth uncovered their heads, when they propheſied[l]. This again was probably an imitation of heathen cuſtoms: for not only the Bacchæ did the ſame, but other pretended propheteſſes uncovered their heads and diſhevelled their hair, in order to ſhew their ſacred fury and enthuſiaſtic rage[m]. The reader therefore will not think it extraordinary, that St. Paul in the eleventh chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians ſhould oppoſe ſo ſuperſtitious and offenſive a cuſtom.

11. In the exerciſe of extraordinary gifts many things were done, which obſtructed general edification. Some, who were vain of their gifts, abuſed them in ſuch a manner, as to prevent other members from ſpeaking in the congregation[n]. This was not practicable in the caſe of all gifts: no one, for inſtance, could propheſy, if the Holy Ghoſt did not inſpire him. But the gift of tongues was ſo conferred, that whoever poſſeſſed it could ſpeak at all times in foreign languages, without waiting for a freſh inſpiration. Conſequently this gift was the moſt liable to abuſe, and therefore St. Paul in the fourteenth chapter endeavours to regulate the uſe of it, and likewiſe to ſhew that it is not the moſt important gift of the Holy Ghoſt. Some commentators ſuppoſe that St. Paul's principal adverſary was a Jew, who was particularly vain of ſpeaking Hebrew. If this be true, we muſt conclude that he was an impudent impoſtor, who laid claim to gifts, which he did not poſſeſs, and endeavoured to

[k] See Numb. v. 18. 2 Sam. vi. 20. and Bayle's Dictionary. Art. Babylon.

[l] 1 Cor. xi. 5.

[m] Thus Virgil ſays, Æneid. Lib. IV. 509.

——— Crines effuſa ſacerdos,
Ter centum tonat ore Deos.

And Lib. VI. 46.

——— Cui talia fanti
Ante ſores ſubito non vultus non color unus,
Non *comtæ* manſere *comæ*.

[n] 1 Cor. xiv. 30—33.

to make the credulous and illiterate believe, that a language, which was learned by every well educated Jew, had been communicated to him by the ſupernatural intervention of the Holy Ghoſt[o].

12. In the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians we find the plaineſt indications, that they celebrated Sunday. They aſſembled on the firſt day of the week (κατα μιαν σαββατων[p]): and the expreſſion κυριακον δειπνον, 1 Cor. xi. 20. may be tranſlated, as in the Syriac verſion, 'a meal which is proper for the Lord's day,' or, 'a Sunday meal.' In the controverſy relative to the celebration of Sunday, it is extraordinary that this tranſlation of κυριακον δειπνον in ſo ancient a verſion as the Syriac ſhould never have been quoted. On this ſubject the reader may conſult Pliny's Epiſtles, Lib. X. Ep. xcvii. 7. and Böhmer's Diſſertatio prima juris eccleſiaſtici antiqui ad Plinium.

On Sunday therefore it was the practice of the primitive Chriſtians to celebrate the Lord's ſupper: and this was preceded by their Agapæ, or feaſts of love. Böhmer, in his Diſſertatio quarta juris eccleſiaſtici antiqui ad Plinium, has ſo fully explained this matter, that it is unneceſſary to ſay any thing further on it. The eleventh chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians ſhews that theſe Agapæ were cuſtomary alſo at Corinth.

13. The Jews, who lived out of Paleſtine, were chiefly engaged in trade, and were in general in more affluent circumſtances, than thoſe, who reſided in Judæa, to whom they uſually ſent an annual relief[q]. Now as the Gentile Chriſtians became brethren to the Jews, and partook of their ſpiritual riches, St. Paul thought it equitable that the Greek Chriſtians ſhould contribute to the ſupport of their poorer brethren in Judæa[r]. When he was at Jeruſalem, he had promiſed Peter, and James, that he would collect alms for this purpoſe[s]: and accordingly

[o] See 1 Cor. xiv. 37. 38.

[p] 1 Cor. xvi. 1. compared with Matth. xxviii. 1.

[q] Vitringa de Syn. Vet. Lib. III. P. I. c. 13.

[r] Rom. xv. 26. 27. [s] Gal. ii. 10.

cordingly we find that he made a collection among the Chriſtians at Corinth [t].

14. Some of the Corinthian Chriſtians denied the reſurrection of the dead [u]. If St. Paul's principal adverſary at Corinth, was a Sadducee, it is not extraordinary that the Apoſtle ſhould have met with oppoſition on this doctrine. One of the moſt ſpecious arguments againſt the reſurrection of the dead ſeems to have been founded on the unfitneſs of our groſs body, and eſpecially of ſome of its members, for eternal life: an argument, to which St. Paul has replied, 1 Cor. xv. 35. In like manner the Sadducees had attempted to ſilence Chriſt [w]: but the adverſaries of this doctrine at Corinth made uſe perhaps of other arguments, and on the principle that evil derived its origin from matter, contended that a re-union with ſinful matter could be of no advantage to a pure and intellectual ſoul.

SECT. III.

Of the Epiſtle of the Corinthians to St. Paul.

THE more immediate occaſion of St. Paul's firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, namely of thoſe which are now extant, was an Epiſtle which he had received from the Corinthians by the hands of Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus [x]. St. Paul had already warned them in a former Epiſtle, 'not to company with fornicators [y].' This Epiſtle is now loſt: for though we have an Epiſtle of St. Paul to the Corinthians in the Armenian language, which was publiſhed by the two Whiſtons, and annexed to their edition of Moſis Chorenenſis Hiſtoria Armenica, yet Moſheim in his Expoſition of the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians [z] rightly judges that this

[t] 1 Cor. xvi. 1.—4. [u] 1 Cor. xv. 12. [w] Matth. xxii. 24—28.
[x] 1 Cor. vii. 1. xvi. 17. [y] Ch. v 9. [z] Pag. 19.

this is a ſpurious production. That St. Paul had really written an Epiſtle to the Corinthians before he wrote that, which we call his firſt Epiſtle[a], is evident from what

[a] Dr. Stoſch in his above-quoted treatiſe, De Epiſtolis Apoſtolorum non deperditis, p. 75. has taken great pains to ſhew, that St. Paul by Εγραψα υμιν εν τη επιστολη, μη συναναμιγνυσθαι πορνοις, 1 Cor. v. 9. meant no other than the Epiſtle, which he was then writing. He contends that the Aoriſt εγραψα may be taken in the preſent, as well as in the paſt time. But even if this be admitted, it will not be ſufficient for his purpoſe: for in order to make εγραψα applicable to what we call the firſt Epiſtle, it muſt be explained of what St. Paul was then *going* to write, an explanation of which an Indicative Aoriſt is ſurely incapable. Beſides, if St. Paul had meant to ſay, 'in *this* Epiſtle,' he would hardly have uſed εν τη επιστολη.

If we read the whole paſſage, 1 Cor. v. 9—11. in connexion, the matter will become ſtill more certain. 'I wrote to you in an Epiſtle, not to company with fornicators: yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then muſt ye needs go out of the world. But now have I written unto you, not to keep company, if any man, that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard: with ſuch an one no not to eat.' It is evident therefore from what St. Paul himſelf ſays, that it was his intention in the Epiſtle which he was then writing to give a clearer explanation of the words, 'not to company with fornicators,' which he had written elſewhere, and which perhaps had been taken in a ſenſe not meant by the Apoſtle. He explains therefore and ſays, that they were not to be underſtood of 'fornicators of this world, &c. for then muſt ye needs go out of the world.' Conſequently, all the paſſages, which Dr. Stoſch has ſelected from the firſt (as it is called) Epiſtle to the Corinthians, relative to unchaſtity, are foreign to the purpoſe. The only part of the whole Epiſtle, which appears to be applicable to the preſent ſubject is 1 Cor. v. 1—8. the paſſage immediately preceding that, with which we are now concerned. This paſſage contains indeed St. Paul's command to expel from the community the inceſtuous perſon: yet it cannot be the paſſage, which he had in view, when he ſaid ver. 9. 'I wrote to you in an Epiſtle, not to company with fornicators.' For in the firſt place, it does not contain the words, of which St. Paul gave an explanation: and when a difficult or ambiguous expreſſion is to be explained, the words in queſtion muſt be retained, for if it be quoted in other terms, the explanation is nothing. Nor does it contain them even in ſubſtance: for it contains nothing, from which an inference can be drawn, that all intercourſe in civil ſociety with perſons of unchaſte character muſt be avoided. We muſt conclude therefore that the words 'not to company with fornicators,' which are not in St. Paul's firſt Epiſtle now extant, had been uſed by the Apoſtle in a preceding Epiſtle, in which perhaps he had cautioned them, in general terms, and without entering into particulars, not to ſuffer men whoſe lives were openly vicious

what Moſheim has ſaid in his Note to 1 Cor. v. 9. In this Epiſtle were contained ſeveral things, which the Corinthians did not underſtand, and of which they deſired an explanation. At the ſame time they deſired that Apollos would come to them, to which St. Paul anſwers, ch. xvi. 12.

On the general contents of this Epiſtle I ſhall not hazard a conjecture; but of a part of it we may form ſome judgement, from the queſtions, which the Corinthians, in anſwer to it propoſed to the Apoſtle. Theſe queſtions were:

1. Whether it were, in general, good and commendable to marry. 2. Whether it were neceſſary to ſeparate from an unbelieving conſort.

The former of theſe queſtions was diviſible into two, each of which required a diſtinct anſwer, the one relative to virgins, the other to widows: for, when a widow married again, it was conſidered by the heathens as a breach of propriety[b].

But who was there at Corinth, that could entertain any doubt of the lawfulneſs of marriage? The ruling party of the Chriſtian community in that city had certainly no ſuch doubt: for they had approved even of an inceſtuous marriage, and their conduct was ſuch, that the Apoſtle had judged it neceſſary to caution them againſt fornication. It appears then, that only ſome few members of the Corinthian community, whoſe conſciences were tenderer, than their minds were ſtrong, had ſcruples in regard to matrimony: and this is probably, the reaſon why the Apoſtle anſwers the queſtion with gentleneſs, that he might not expoſe to ſhame thoſe who had propoſed it. If the ſame doubts had been ſtarted

vicious, like that of the inceſtuous perſon, to continue members of the Corinthian community. As the general expreſſion, which he had uſed through motives of delicacy had not produced its proper effect, he was obliged in his next Epiſtle to point out whom he meant in particular. At the ſame time, he explained and limited the command in ſuch a manner, that it ſhould not be underſtood, as containing an abſolute prohibition to engage in common tranſactions with men of bad character.

[b] Vitringa de Syn. Vet. Lib. III. P. I. c. 4. p. 658—661.

ſtarted at Epheſus or Coloſſæ, where the adverſaries of matrimony grounded their objections on principles, which were injurious to morality[c], the anſwer of St. Paul would probably have been different. On reading what the Apoſtle has written, 1 Cor. vii. 6. one might conclude that the opponents of theſe ſcrupulous perſons at Corinth had gone too far on the other ſide, and maintained not only the lawfulneſs, but the abſolute neceſſity of matrimony, a poſition which may be ſupported by ſpecious arguments, and is agreeable to the doctrine of the Phariſees. If no one had gone theſe lengths, the Apoſtle would not have thought it neceſſary to ſay, that he permitted, but did not command matrimony.

The ſeventh chapter of St. Paul's firſt Epiſtle would be much more intelligible, if we had a preciſe knowledge of the objections, which ſome of the Corinthians had made to matrimony. The rejection of a ſtate of life, which is neceſſary for the propagation of the human ſpecies, and the notion of a certain holineſs in celibacy, which began at an early age to infect the Chriſtian church, undoubtedly took its riſe in ſome heathen philoſophy. It certainly had not its origin in Judaiſm; for the Old Teſtament is highly favourable to marriage, and repreſents a numerous progeny, as one of the greateſt bleſſings. It is true that the Eſſenes, who thought matrimony unworthy of a wiſe man, were a Jewiſh ſect: but this doctrine they derived from the Oriental philoſophy, not from the Jewiſh religion. Nor do any of the precepts of Chriſt, repreſent matrimony in an unfavourable light, or celibacy as a ſtate of greater holineſs. Egypt and the Eaſt were the countries, which gave birth to theſe ſuperſtitious notions, and afterwards generated the race of monks. If we examine the principles on which the Eſſenes, and the ſtill later Manichæans, objected to matrimony, we may, by comparing them with St. Paul's anſwers, form ſome notion of the particular objections, which had been made to matrimony at Corinth.

Some

[c] See Col. ii. and 1 Tim. iv.

Some heretics, who made their appearance at a later age, but who derived their notions from a more ancient Oriental philoſophy[d], not from the Chriſtian religion, rejected matrimony as being ordained by the Creator of the world, whom they conſidered either as an evil Spirit, or at leaſt as a ſpirit, who was not omniſcient. Such an objection would affect the very foundation of Chriſtianity, which repreſents the Creator as the ſupreme and all-wiſe God. But it does not appear that this objection had been made at Corinth: for St. Paul's anſwer contains nothing, which is directly oppoſed to it.

He is equally ſilent on another objection, which the Manichæans and others made to matrimony. Theſe conſidered the ſoul as pure and innocent, and aſcribed the origin of ſin to the groſs matter, of which the body was compoſed, and which from its very nature was wholly incapable of being brought to a ſtate of perfect purity. Now ſince the ſoul was impriſoned during the preſent life in this groſs body, and the procreation of children occaſioned ſuch impriſonments, it was the duty of a wiſe man to abſtain from it. This objection would have again affected the foundation of Chriſtianity, and would have merited a ſeverer anſwer than was given by St. Paul: for on the very ſame principles the Reſurrection of the Dead muſt be conſidered as a misfortune, and as a freſh impriſonment of the ſoul, which had been delivered by death from its former ſtate of confinement.

Nor do the Corinthian adverſaries of matrimony appear to have objected to it on account of the ſenſual pleaſures, which attend it: an objection, which would likewiſe have produced evil conſequences, as it is the offſpring of a gloomy and unnatural ſyſtem of morality. At leaſt in St. Paul's anſwer there is nothing, which implies this objection. Many ancient fathers, as well as the ancient heretics conſidered ſenſual enjoyments, and the pleaſures even of the marriage bed, as a ſin; and arguing therefore from the cauſe to the effect, they aſſerted

[d] See Beauſobre Hiſtoire de Manichée et du Manicheiſme. Liv. vii. ch. 3. 4.

aſſerted that every child was therefore a creature of the devil. But theſe notions were not entertained by the Corinthian adverſaries of matrimony, as appears from 1 Cor. vii. 14. For there the Apoſtle anſwers the queſtions, whether children born of parents, of whom one only was a Chriſtian, and the other a heathen, were holy: which implies that the Corinthians had no doubts on this ſubject, when both the parents were Chriſtians, and conſequently that they did not believe that children born of Chriſtian parents were creatures of the devil. Further, it is evident from what St. Paul has ſaid, 1 Cor. vii. 32—34. that the Corinthians did not conſider the pleaſures of matrimony as a crime.

There remains therefore no objection, which the Corinthian adverſaries of matrimony could have made, but one of the following kind, which is the moſt innocent, and has no bad effects on the doctrines of faith and morality. 'Matrimony is a very precarious ſtate, in which we ſacrifice a part of our liberty and enjoyments, in which we muſt expect to ſuffer various inconveniences, and are expoſed to the caprice and weakneſs of the perſon, with whom we are united. If the choice, which we have made, proves to be a bad one, the inconveniences, to which we have ſubjected ourſelves, increaſe in proportion to the evil diſpoſition and conduct of our conſort. Whoever marries therefore places his happineſs in a ſcale, without knowing on which ſide it will preponderate. Further, the ſupport and education of children is frequently a heavy burthen. A moderate income, which would enable a ſingle perſon to live with comfort, is inſufficient to ſupply the exigencies of a family: and therefore matrimony may reduce us to diſtreſs, and even to miſery. Again, the conſtant attention to economical concerns, and the neceſſary labour in procuring the means of ſubſiſtence, ſo completely occupy our time in a ſtate of wedlock, that we have very little left for the exerciſe of private contemplation, and the performance of religious rites. Whoever is wiſe therefore will avoid entering into ſuch a ſtate: or if he has

entered into it, will endeavour, if poſſible, to obtain a ſeparation, eſpecially if the other party is an unbeliever.' In this manner the Eſſenes objected to matrimony [e]: and its adverſaries at Corinth objected probably in the ſame way. St. Paul, in his anſwer to them, acknowledges more than once, that it is prudent not to marry: and adviſes therefore all thoſe to abſtain from it, who do not feel themſelves under a neceſſity of marrying. But on the other hand, ſince moſt men who are in health, and in the prime of their life, are inclined to indulge a propenſity, which, though it frequently leads to inconveniencies, is neceſſary for the continuance of the human ſpecies, St. Paul aſſures them that it is 'better to marry than to burn.' To thoſe who are already married he ſays that it is unlawful to ſeparate: and he adds, that for theſe he had the command of the Lord, to continue in wedlock. For, whatever may be the inconveniencies attending this ſtate, yet, when we have once pledged our faith, we are bound to fulfil our engagements.

SECT. IV.

Contents of the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians.

THIS Epiſtle may be conveniently divided into the following ſections.

1. The Introduction, ch. i. 1—9. St. Paul expreſſes his ſatisfaction at all the good, which he knew of them, particularly at their having received the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, for the confirmation of the Goſpel.

2. He rebukes the ſectaries among them, and defends himſelf againſt his adverſary, to whom moſt of the Corinthians adhered, ch. i. 10. iv. 21.

3. He

[e] The grounds, on which the Eſſenes objected to matrimony are given by Philo, Vol. II. p. 633—634. ed. Mangey. I have not quoted the very words of Philo, but have choſen rather to ſtate the objection according to our modes of thinking.

3. He orders them to excommunicate the inceſtuous perſon, and to acknowledge no public fornicator as a brother, ch. v. 1—13.

4. He rebukes thoſe, who brought their accuſations before heathen judicatures, ch. vi. 1—9.

5. He teaches the Corinthians that fornication is not a matter indifferent, ch. vi. 10—20.

6. He anſwers their queries relating to marriage, ch. vii. 1—40.

7. He inſtructs them how to act, in regard to idol offerings. He judges it ſinful to go to an entertainment in the temple of an idol, but not ſo, to partake at another place of meats, which had been offered to idols. However he adviſes abſtinence even from this, if a weak brother be preſent, who would take offence at it. He illuſtrates the caſe by his own example, ſaying that he abſtained from many things, which in themſelves were lawful, becauſe he would not excite a prejudice againſt the Goſpel even in weak minds. He takes this occaſion alſo to ſhew, why he had accepted no preſents from the Corinthians, ch. viii. 1. xi. 1.

8. He cenſures the unuſual dreſs adopted by both ſexes in propheſying, ch. xi. 2—17. and

9. The irregularities committed at their love-feaſts ver. 18—34. and alſo

10. Their abuſe of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, ch. xii. 1.—xiv. 40.

11. He aſſerts the Reſurrection of the Dead, ch. xv. 1—58.

12. He gives rules for the collection of alms, promiſes a viſit to the Corinthian community, and ſalutes ſome of its members.

SECT. V.

Of the effects of this Epiſtle on the Corinthians.

THIS Epiſtle produced on the different members of the Corinthian community very different effects. Many of them amended their conduct: and moſt of them had ſuch reſpect for the Apoſtle, that they excommunicated the inceſtuous perſon[f]. They requeſted the Apoſtle's return with tears[g], and became zealous for him, that is, they vindicated him and his office againſt the falſe teacher and his adherents[h]. In ſhort, they ſhewed ſtrong marks of an earneſt repentance.

Yet the falſe teacher retained his party, which now began to go greater lengths than before. We ſee from the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth chapters of the ſecond Epiſtle, that they denied St. Paul's apoſtolical miniſtry: and they grounded this denial on what the Apoſtle himſelf had written. In a former Epiſtle, probably in that which is now loſt, he had ſignified his intention of coming from Epheſus to Corinth, of going thence into Macedonia, and from Macedonia of again returning to Corinth[i]. But the unhappy ſtate of the Corinthian church altered his intention[k]: ſince he found that he muſt have treated them with ſeverity. He was willing therefore firſt to ſend them a written admonition, and to wait ſome time for their amendment. Hence he tells them, 1 Cor. xvi. 7. that he then intended to go from Epheſus into Macedonia, and that from Macedonia he would make them a viſit; which intention he put in execution, as appears from what St. Luke has ſaid Acts xx. 1—2. On this conduct of St. Paul the party of his adverſary made the two following remarks.

Firſt, they ſaid that he was very irreſolute in his conduct, that what he determined one day he rejected the next, and that 'his word toward them was yea and nay[l].' How then, they argued, could ſuch a man be a Prophet;

[f] 2 Cor. ii. 5—11. vii. 11. [g] Ch. vii. 7. [h] Ch. vii. 7—11.
[i] 2 Cor. i. 15—16. [k] Ver. 23. [l] 2 Cor. i. 18.

Prophet, or an Apoſtle? If he were inveſted with this character, he would not contradict himſelf, and recal to morrow what he promiſed to-day.

This was a very ſpecious objection, and St. Paul has given it its full force, 2 Cor. i. 17. The objections of the ancients, againſt the divine authority of the Apoſtles and of the Goſpel, are in fact the moſt material: and the reader perhaps will be anxious to know how this objection may be anſwered.

1. It cannot reaſonably be expected of a Prophet, that he ſhould be omniſcient, and that his divine inſpiration ſhould extend to all poſſible objects. He is divinely inſpired with what he is to deliver to men in the name of God, but not with all the circumſtances of human life or of his future conduct. He is infallible, and cannot contradict himſelf in thoſe matters, which he knows by inſpiration: but in other reſpects, and when he ſpeaks not in the name of God, he is no more than a man. This is the rational notion of a Prophet: and he is ſo deſcribed in the Old Teſtament. Moſes himſelf was fallible, till he conſulted God[m]: and Nathan anſwered the queſtion of David, whether he ſhould build a temple, in the affirmative, when he followed his own human judgement, but he diſſuaded David from the undertaking, after he had had a divine viſion[n]. It was therefore a falſe concluſion, that St. Paul was not an Apoſtle, and that his Goſpel was not divine, becauſe he had changed a former reſolution. This is the ſubſtance of what St. Paul himſelf anſwers. 2 Cor. i. 18—22. where he declares, that however he had altered his intentions he had made no alteration in his Goſpel, which God had declared to be divine by the communication of ſpiritual gifts.

2. It is poſſible to predict a thing, which never takes place, without incurring the charge of falſhood or impoſture: namely when certain conditions are either expreſſed, or tacitly implied. When, for inſtance, I promiſe any man that I will frequently viſit him, the condition

[m] Numb. xxxii. 6—15. [n] 2 Sam. vii.

condition that we continue friends, and that my viſits are acceptable, is neceſſarily implied. If we ceaſe to be friends, he will not accuſe me of falſhood for ceaſing to viſit him.

The Prophets of the Old Teſtament themſelves ſometimes foretold things under certain conditions, as Jonas for inſtance foretold the deſtruction of Niniveh, which did not take place, becauſe the conditions, which depended on the will of men, were altered.

Thus St. Paul had formerly promiſed the Corinthians, while he was on amicable terms with them, to return before he went into Macedonia, that he might a ſecond time impart to them the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt [a]. But when the face of the things was totally changed at Corinth, and the Corinthians themſelves did not fulfil the conditions, which St. Paul's promiſe preſuppoſed; when they had fallen into errors and extravagancies, which rendered it impoſſible for him to impart to them the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, he thought it neceſſary to alter his route, and not to viſit them again, till his Epiſtles had produced ſome amendment.

The other concluſion drawn by St. Paul's adverſary was, that the Apoſtle was afraid to return. In anſwer to this objection St. Paul ſays that he had hitherto ſpared this falſe teacher and his party: but that, if he came again and found no amendment, he ſhould uſe the power committed to him as an Apoſtle, and puniſh ſome of the offenders in a miraculous manner. This would afford a proof of his apoſtolical authority, which however he wiſhed to avoid.

[a] 2 Cor. i. 15.

SECT. VI.

Of the ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians.

SUCH was the ſtate of the Corinthian church, when St. Paul after his departure from Epheſus viſited the Chriſtian communities in Macedonia [p], and received from Titus, whom he had ſent to Corinth, the account that the Corinthians had amended their conduct [q]. It was about this time, (that is about the year 58 of the Chriſtian Era), that he wrote his ſecond Epiſtle, as appears from 2 Cor. viii. 1—5. He ſent it by the hands of Titus, who was inveſted alſo with power to forward the collection for the faithful in Judæa [r]. The ſubſcription mentions that he ſent Luke with Titus, which is grounded on 2 Cor. viii. 18. where St. Paul ſays, 'and we ſent with him the brother, whoſe praiſe is in the Goſpel, throughout all the churches.' Now this brother is explained by many ancient commentators of St. Luke: but this is not only mere conjecture, but one that is difficult to be reconciled [s] with Acts xx. 3—16. That Titus was accompanied by two brethren, when he carried St. Paul's ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians, is certain [t]: but who they were I cannot pretend to determine.

Of the effects, which this Epiſtle produced, we have no circumſtantial accounts: for the journey which St. Paul took to Corinth, after he had written this Epiſtle, St. Luke has mentioned only in a few words, Acts xx. 2—3. We know however that St. Paul was at Corinth after he had written this Epiſtle, that the contributions, which he had ordered to be made for the poor brethren in Jeruſalem, were brought to him thither from different parts [u], and muſt have been very conſiderable, ſince St. Paul himſelf carried them to Jeruſalem [w]: further,

[p] Acts xx. 1. [q] 2 Cor. vii. 5—6. [r] Ch. viii. 6.

[s] See what was ſaid on this ſubject, Ch. vi. Sect. 6.

[t] 2 Cor. viii. 18—24. [u] Rom. xv. 26. [w] 1 Cor. xvi. 3.

ther, that St. Paul ſtaid ſeveral months at Corinth, and that he was greatly reſpected by ſome of the principal members of that church, from whom he ſent ſalutations in his Epiſtle to the Romans *. From this time we hear nothing more of the adverſe party: and when Clement of Rome wrote his Epiſtle to the Corinthians, St. Paul was conſidered by them as a divine Apoſtle, to whoſe authority he might appeal, without fear of contradiction. The falſe teacher therefore muſt either have been ſilenced by St. Paul in virtue of his apoſtolical powers, and by an act of ſeverity, which he had threatened, 2 Cor. xiii. 2—3.: or this adverſary of the Apoſtle had voluntarily quitted the place. Whichever was the cauſe, the effect produced muſt operate as a confirmation of our faith, and as a proof of St. Paul's divine miſſion.

SECT. VII.

Contents of the ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians.

THE contents of this Epiſtle are the following.

1. St. Paul gives the Corinthians an account of his ſufferings to the time of writing this Epiſtle, and of the comfort, which he derived from meditating on the Reſurrection of the Dead, ch. i. 1—11.

2. He vindicates himſelf againſt thoſe, who refuſed to acknowledge him as a true Apoſtle, becauſe he had altered his reſolution of going immediately from Epheſus to Corinth, ch. i. 12. ii. 4.

3. He forgives the inceſtuous perſon, ch. ii. 5—11. and on this occaſion tells the Corinthians, how earneſtly he wiſhes to hear an account of their amendment, ver. 12—13.

4. He treats of the office committed to him of preaching redemption, and highly prefers it to the office of preaching the law, probably becauſe his adverſary had pretended

* Ch. xvi, 21—23.

pretended to be a teacher of the law. This falſe teacher he at the ſame time rebukes for the innovation of reading the law, with his face covered. Further, he ſhews that the ſufferings, which accompany the Goſpel, are no diſgrace either to the Goſpel or its miniſters, and gives a ſhort abſtract of the doctrine, which he preaches, ch. ii. 14. —v. 21.

5. He ſhews that it is his office not only to preach redemption by Chriſt, but likewiſe to inculcate certain duties, eſpecially that of renouncing idolatry, which duty he enforces againſt thoſe, who attended the idol feſtivals, ch. vi. 1—vii. 1.

6. He endeavours again to win the confidence of the Corinthians, by telling them how kindly he was affectioned towards them, and how greatly he rejoiced at their amendment, ch. vii. 2—16.

7. He exhorts them to a liberal collection for the Chriſtians in Judæa.

8. He vindicates himſelf againſt thoſe, who contended that there was not ſufficient proof of his divine miſſion, and who imputed his caution at Corinth to the conſciouſneſs of not being a true Apoſtle, ch. x—xiii.

CHAP. XV.

OF THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

SECT. I.

Of the time, when St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to Timothy.

ABOUT the ſame time that St. Paul wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians, or rather a ſhort time before it, he wrote his firſt Epiſtle to Timothy, as Benſon has very clearly ſhewn in his Prolegomena to this Epiſtle,

tle, to which opinion Lardner likewise upon the whole accedes. Other critics maintain, that it was written about the year of Christ 65, after St. Paul had been discharged from his first imprisonment in Rome, and again visited the church of Ephesus. This opinion, which is patronised by Pearson, le Clerc, Mill, and others, who grounded it merely on an induction made from the common Greek subscription to this Epistle [y], is not very easy to be reconciled [z] with the notion of St. Paul's infallibility or his divine inspiration: for when he took leave of the elders at Ephesus in the year 58, he assured them that they would see his face no more [a]. Now it is hardly credible that all the Elders at Ephesus died within the space of five, or even seven years: and we know from 1 Tim. i. 3. that when St. Paul wrote to Timothy, he had left him at Ephesus only a short time before.

The principal arguments, by which Dr. Benson has proved his position, are the following.

1. It appears plainly from the third chapter of this Epistle, that no bishops had been then appointed at Ephesus. St. Paul instructs Timothy in the choice of persons

[y] Προς Τιμοθεον πρωτη εγραφη απο Λαοδικειας, ητις εστι μητροπολις Φρυγιας της Πακατιανης. Now were it true, that this Epistle was written at Laodicea, it was certainly written after the expiration of St. Paul's imprisonment: for before that time he had never been at Laodicea, as appears from Coloss. ii. 1. But this subscription is undoubtedly erroneous: for when St. Paul wrote his first Epistle to Timothy, he had lately left Ephesus, and was gone, not into Phrygia, but into Macedonia, as the Apostle himself says, 1 Tim. i. 3. Wetstein has quoted other subscriptions, in which different, and more probable places are assigned. For instance, the subscription in one of Stephens's MSS. has Macedonia, and that in the Coptic version, to which may be added the Arabic version published by Erpenius, has Athens.

[z] In the first edition I represented it as wholly irreconcileable, which I here change into a more moderate expression, because it may be objected that Acts xx. 25. ('Ye all shall see my face no more') is capable of being interpreted in such a manner, as to denote that St. Paul would not see *all* the Elders at Ephesus again assembled together, not that he would see none of them again.

[a] Acts xx. 25.

perſons to be appointed to that office, and expreſſes his deſire and intention of ſoon returning to Epheſus. Now he could not have in view an office, which had been already filled, and was then vacant: and, as it was the uſual practice of the Apoſtles, when they had eſtabliſhed a Chriſtian community, to wait till they were acquainted with the conduct of its ſeveral members, before they ſelected perſons to be biſhops, it ſeems as if none had been appointed at Epheſus, when St. Paul firſt wrote to Timothy. But it is not probable, that he left the Chriſtian community at Epheſus for a long time without governors. Now he departed from Epheſus, when he travelled into Macedonia and Greece, as appears from Acts xx. 1.: and we ſee from ver. 17—28. that on his return to Epheſus biſhops had been already appointed. Conſequently this Epiſtle muſt have been written on his journey, and even at the beginning of it: for Timothy left Epheſus not long after St. Paul, as appears from Acts xx. 4. where we find him at Corinth in company with St. Paul, when the Apoſtle left that city to go again to Epheſus. In fact Timothy muſt have come ſtill earlier to St. Paul, when he was travelling through Macedonia to Corinth: for the ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians, which was written in Macedonia, was ſent in the joint names of Paul and Timothy[b]. The firſt Epiſtle to Timothy therefore was written, as I obſerved at the beginning of this ſection, a ſhort time before the ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians.

2. Timothy, when St. Paul wrote to him his firſt Epiſtle, was in danger of being deſpiſed on account of his youth[c]. But he became an aſſociate of St. Paul at Lyſtra[d], ſo early as the year 50, according to the common calculation, and perhaps according to a more exact calculation, ſtill earlier[e]. Now when he was choſen by St. Paul, as an aſſiſtant in the propagation of the Goſpel, the leaſt age, which we can aſcribe to him is that of twenty. Conſequently, if the firſt Epiſtle to him was written

[b] 2 Cor. i. 1.
[c] 1 Tim. iv. 12.
[d] Acts xvi. 1.
[e] See Ch. xi. Sect. 1.

written so late as the year 65, he was not only at least thirty-five years of age, but had been a preacher of the Gospel not less than fifteen years. Under these circumstances he could have been in no danger of being despised on account of his youth: but he certainly was so, before he had reached his twenty-seventh year.

I therefore agree with Dr. Benson in dating this Epistle at the time of St. Paul's journey into Macedonia mentioned Acts xx. 1.: but in what particular town it was written I cannot determine, nor is it of any importance to the understanding of the Epistle. Now, if St. Paul wrote during this journey to Timothy at Ephesus, Timothy must have returned to the Apostle at Ephesus, after he had taken the journey from that city into Greece, which is mentioned, Acts xix. 21—22. 1 Cor. iv. 17. St. Paul was obliged to leave the Ephesian community sooner than he intended, because Demetrius excited an insurrection against him. He therefore left Timothy behind him at Ephesus[f], to re-establish order in the church, to fill the ecclesiastical offices, and to oppose the false teachers.

Now as Timothy knew perfectly well the charge, which was committed to him, an Epistle like this was not necessary merely for his sake. But as some of the Ephesians would not submit to him, and others intruded themselves as bishops and ministers, St. Paul wrote this Epistle, which he might lay before them as a document, in which the Apostle invested him with full powers. It may be considered therefore as an Epistle to the Ephesians, as well as to Timothy, See ch. i. 3. 18. iv. 6. 12. 13. v. 23.: which passages, and likewise several others in the Epistle, receive a light from this observation.

Of the person and parentage of Timothy we read an account, Acts xvi. 1—3.: and from various parts of the New Testament we learn that he was almost the constant companion of St. Paul.

[f] 1 Tim. i. 3.

SECT. II.

General remarks on the ſect of the Eſſenes, who had already inculcated their doctrines at Epheſus, when St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to Timothy.

IT is abſolutely neceſſary to be acquainted with the ſtate of the Epheſian church, in order to underſtand the Epiſtles of St. Paul to Timothy, and to the Epheſians [g]. But before we can form a true judgement of the ſtate of the Epheſian church, we muſt acquire ſome knowledge of the Eſſenes, a Jewiſh ſect which began to ſpread itſelf at Epheſus, and to threaten great miſchief to Chriſtianity: for which reaſon the Apoſtle in the above-mentioned Epiſtles, and likewiſe in that to the Coloſſians declared himſelf openly againſt them.

Among ancient writers, there are four, who have given ſome account of this ſect. Philo mentions them in the treatiſe, where he proves the maxim, that every virtuous man is free, and deſcribes them more fully in his eſſay on contemplative life. He has likewiſe ſpoken of them in a paſſage of his Apology for the Jews, which is quoted by Euſebius [h]. The name, by which he has called them in Greek, is Θεραπευται, which in the Greek language ſignifies what Eſſene ſignifies in Egyptian, and is in fact nothing more than a tranſlation of it [i]. He deſcribes them in a very favourable manner, which in Philo is by no means extraordinary, for they united the philoſophy of Egypt, where Philo both lived and had been educated, with the doctrines of the Jews [k]. But that

[g] To theſe may be added likewiſe the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, to which they have a great reſemblance.

[h] Præpar. Evang. Lib. VIII. 10.

[i] See the Theſ. Epiſt. la Crozianus, Tom. III. p. 168.

[k] It is not improbable that he had the Eſſenes in view in thoſe places, where he deſcribes the perfectly wiſe and virtuous man, who retires from the buſtle of the world to enjoy private contemplation.

that Josephus, who was educated in the school of the Pharisees, judged likewise very favourably of the Essenes may afford matter of surprise. He was probably deceived by the appearance of sanctity, which they affected, a sanctity extravagant and inconsistent with a rational system of morals, which St. Paul therefore, who had a greater share of penetration, very properly condemned. The place in which Josephus treats most fully of the Essenes is, Bell. Jud. Lib. II. cap. 8.: but he has likewise given some short accounts of them in the following passages, Antiquit. Lib. XIII. c. 5. § 9. L. XV. c. 10. § 4—5. L. XVII. c. 12. § 3. and L. XVIII. c. 1. § 5. all which passages deserve to be read. Pliny in his Hist. natur. Lib. V. c. 17. has also given an account of the Essenes, and has related some circumstances, which are noticed neither by Philo nor by Josephus. Solinus, in his Polyhistor, cap. 35. has repeated what Pliny had said, but with an intermixture of error, and a fabulous addition.

It is unnecessary to quote the modern writers, who have written on the sect of the Essenes[l]: but I cannot pass over in silence the controversy which was conducted on this subject by the Jesuit Nicolaus Serarius on the one side, and Joh. Drusius, and Joseph Scaliger, on the other. The similarity of the sentiments of the Essenes to those of the church of Rome induced Serarius to seek for them an honourable origin. He contended therefore that they were Asideans, and derived them from the Rechabites mentioned in the Old Testament: at the same time he asserted that the first Christian monks were Essenes. Both of the positions were denied by his antagonists: but in respect to the latter, Serarius was certainly in the right. The Essenes were indeed a Jewish and not a Christian sect: but it is evident from the above-mentioned Epistles of St. Paul, that to the great mortification of the Apostle they insinuated themselves very early into the Christian church. Eusebius has fully shewn[m], that the monastic life was derived from

[l] Fabricii Lux salutaris Evangelii, cap. IV. p. 55.

[m] Hist. Eccles. Lib. II. cap. 17.

from the Eſſenes: and, becauſe many Chriſtians adopted the manners of the Eſſenes, Epiphanius [a] took the Eſſenes in general for Chriſtians, and confounded them with the Nazarenes, a confuſion to which the ſimilarity of this name to that of the Nazarites of the Old Teſtament might in ſome meaſure contribute. However it does no honour to the monaſtic life to derive it from the Eſſenes: for St. Paul cautions Timothy againſt this ſect, and in the fourth chapter declares, that it would be the cauſe of that great apoſtacy, which had been foretold by the Spirit.

The controverſy, which has been conducted relative to the Therapeutæ, whom ſome writers diſtinguiſh from the Eſſenes, is related by Moſheim in his Inſtitutiones hiſtoriæ Chriſtianæ majores, Sæc. I. P. i. cap. 2. § 13. Montfaucon and Helyot have attempted to prove them Chriſtians, but the former has been confuted by Boulier. The late Dr. Lange in his two diſſertations De Thereapeutis in Ægypto et Eſſenis, contends that they were nothing more than circumciſed Egyptians: but this opinion has been confuted by Dr. Heumann. From the Theſaurus Epiſt. la Crozianus, Tom. III. p. 170. it appears, that La Croze alſo conſidered the Therapeutæ as circumciſed Egyptians: and that Jablonſky intended to write on this ſubject, which however he did not put in execution.

[a] Hæreſ. XXIX.

SECT. III.

Of the principal doctrines and cuſtoms of the Eſſenes, againſt whom St. Paul wrote his firſt Epiſtle to Timothy, as alſo thoſe to the Epheſians and Coloſſians.

THE ſcattered accounts, given by Philo and Joſephus, of the Eſſenes, may be all explained from the principles of that philoſophy, which may be termed the oriental or the Gnoſtic, and which I preſume the reader has already learnt from eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. It muſt be obſerved however, that the Eſſenes did not adopt all the peculiarities of this philoſophy, for they confined themſelves chiefly to the moral part of it, which they received in its moſt gloomy and monaſtic form. That they rejected the ſpeculative parts of this philoſophy, eſpecially what related to the creation, we may conclude from the circumſtance that Philo has ſo highly extolled them: which he certainly would not have done, if they had repreſented the Creator as a Spirit, inferior to the Supreme Being, and capable of error, becauſe this doctrine of the Gnoſtics is reprobated by Philo in the ſtrongeſt terms.

The Eſſenes held the names of their angels as ſacred, and therefore not to be uttered. Theſe angels were probably conſidered as their mediators with God, in which reſpect the other Egyptian Jews, and even Philo himſelf, concurred with them.

They abſtained from blood: and thoſe, who lived in Egypt would not even offer a ſacrifice, becauſe they regarded the ſlaying of beaſts as ſinful. They conſidered wine as a poiſon, which deprives men of their ſenſes: and partook of no other food than bread, ſalt, water, and at the utmoſt of hyſſop. Solinus indeed pretends that they ate dates: but he ſeems to have

miſunderſtood Pliny, from whom he copied, and who calls the ſect of the Eſſenes 'Socia palmarum,' that is, 'who dwelt near palm trees.' They even thought it dangerous to the ſoul to ſatisfy the body. Many of them ate only once in three days, and ſome only once a week: and this in the night, becauſe they eſteemed it a work fit only for darkneſs to relieve the wants of the body. They thought themſelves greatly defiled after touching oil, or a young man, and in order to remove the ſtain they carefully waſhed the place of contact. Moſt of them abſtained from marriage, and thought it an obſtacle to the ſearch after wiſdom. The places, in which they purſued their meditations, and which they held ſacred, were called μοναστηρια. All ornamental dreſs they deteſted. They maintained a perfect community of goods, and an equality of external rank, conſidering vaſſalage as a violation of the laws of nature. They believed the ſoul would live for ever: but they ſeem to have denied the reſurrection of the body, which according to their principles would only render the ſoul ſinful by being reunited with it.

They attributed a natural holineſs to the ſabbath day, becauſe it is the ſeventh: and the number ſeven reſults from adding the ſides of a ſquare to thoſe of a triangle. They obſerved the ſabbath therefore more ſtrictly than other Jews, and avoided as much as poſſible on this day to perform the neceſſary offices of nature.

They ſpent moſt of their time in contemplation, which they called philoſophical, and boaſted of a philoſophy pretended to be derived from their anceſtors, with which the pages in Philo and Joſephus quoted in the preceding ſection abound.

After this ſtatement of the doctrine and manner of the Eſſenes, the reader will eaſily perceive from the contents of St. Paul's firſt Epiſtle to Timothy, and of thoſe to the Epheſians and Coloſſians, that they were written with a view of confuting the errors of this ſect.

These three Epistles have a striking affinity to each other. The Epistle to the Colossians resembles that to the Ephesians both in its contents, and in its language, so that the one illustrates the other. In all three the Apostle shews the superiority of Christ to the angels, and warns the Christians against the worship of angels. He censures the observation of sabbaths, rebukes those, who forbid marriage, and the touching of certain things, who deliver commandments of men concerning meats, and prohibit them. He permits Timothy to drink wine, blames those, who abstain from nourishing their bodies, and enjoin various bodily exercises. He cautions his readers against a philosophy, which teaches all these things, and against persons, who assume a great appearance of wisdom and virtue. Further, the Apostle delivers Hymenæus over to Satan, because he pretended, that there was no resurrection of the flesh. Lastly, the very words, which Philo has used in describing the tenets of the Essenes, are for the most part retained by St. Paul. It is manifest therefore that the Apostle wrote with a view of confuting this sect.

The only objection which could be made to this opinion is, that the Essenes lived, as is generally supposed, in deserts and not in towns: whence it might be concluded that the church at Ephesus could not have been infected by them. But if this supposition were true, it would still be possible that their doctrines spread from the retirement of the Essenes into the neighbouring cities; for instance, from the deserts of Egypt into Alexandria. But the notion that the Essenes never resided in towns is a mistake. There is a passage in Josephus, Bell. Jud. Lib. II. § 4. which puts the matter out of doubt: Μια ουκ εστιν αυτων πολις, αλλ' εν εκαστη κατοικουσι πολλοι, and a few lines after, Κηδεμων εν εκαστη πολει της ταγματος εξαιρετως των ξενων αποδεδειγνυται, ταμιευων εσθητα και τα επιτηδεια. This objection therefore is devoid of foundation.

SECT. IV.

Of the more immediate cause of the propagation of the Essene errors at Ephesus.

ST. PAUL's first visit to Ephesus was on the journey, which he made from Corinth to Syria, as appears from Acts xviii. 19. and was about four years before he wrote his first Epistle to Timothy. He had then preached the Gospel the first time at Corinth, and was travelling to Jerusalem, to perform a vow, which he had made. When he left Corinth it does not appear that he had any intention of going to Ephesus, for St. Luke writes, Acts xviii. 18. that he set sail for Syria. Some accident therefore unknown to us must have brought him to Ephesus. At this first visit he seems not to have preached to the Gentiles, on account probably of the shortness of his stay: St. Luke at least says nothing of any conversation at that time with heathens, and mentions only that he taught in the synagogue. Some of the Jews requested him to remain there, with which request he could not comply, but he promised that he would soon return to them. These Jews were either well inclined to Christianity, or had actually received it. He left Aquilas and Priscilla at Ephesus, and travelled himself to Jerusalem. St. Luke indeed does not mention Jerusalem by name: but having related the Apostle's arrival at Cæsarea, ver. 22. he adds that St. Paul 'went up, and saluted the church,' which 'going up' signifies the going up to Jerusalem, as my father has shewn in his Dissertatio de notione inferi et superi in chorographiis sacris, § 36—38.

In the mean time, as we see from ver. 24. the eloquent and learned Jew Apollos arrived at Ephesus. St. Luke says in the following verse, that he was 'instructed in the way of the Lord' (κατηχημενος την οδον

τῆ Κυρίᾳ), by which he means the religion of Christ. The word κατηχημένος represents him as having then only just imbibed the principles of Christianity, not as a person then qualified to be a teacher: though I will not assert that St. Luke intended to describe him as a catechumen, according to the ecclesiastical sense of the term. That his proficiency in Christianity was at that time not very great, appears likewise from what St. Luke has added in the same verse, namely, that though he spake and taught of the Messiah from a knowledge of the Old Testament, he had been initiated only in the baptism of John. But as John the Baptist had taught his disciples that he was only the forerunner of the Messiah, who would baptize with the Holy Ghost, Apollos must have expected the gifts of the Holy Ghost, though he did not know that they had been actually communicated. It is true, that when St. Paul came soon after to Ephesus, he met with twelve other persons, who, like Apollos, had been baptized only according to the baptism of John, and when questioned by St. Paul, whether they had received the gifts of the Holy Ghost, answered, 'We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost[o].' Yet I cannot suppose that either they or Apollos were totally ignorant of the existence of the Holy Ghost, or that they had never heard the name mentioned: and therefore I understand their answer to St. Paul as implying nothing more, than that they did not know whether the great promise was already accomplished, that the Messiah would baptize with the Holy Ghost. Now this deficiency of Apollos in the doctrines of Christianity was supplied by Aquilas and Priscilla, who, on their arrival at Ephesus, gave him further instructions[p].

But even before Apollos had received the instructions of Aquilas and Priscilla, he taught publickly in the Jewish synagogue at Ephesus concerning the Messiah[q]. Hence

[o] Acts xix. 1—7.

[p] Acts xviii. 26.

[q] Ver. 25—26.

Hence it is not improbable, that the Eſſenes introduced themſelves into the church of Epheſus by the means of Apollos, who came from Alexandria, in the neighbourhood of which city, according to Philo, the Eſſenes were not only very numerous, but were held in high eſtimation at Alexandria itſelf. It is true that Apollos is not expreſsly ſaid to have been an Eſſene: but as he had been a member of that ſect, which took its name from the Baptiſt, and this ſect in many reſpects reſembled that of the Eſſenes, eſpecially in their ſtrict faſts, it is highly probable that Apollos, before he was better inſtructed, had ſuffered himſelf to be blinded by that external appearance of wiſdom and ſanctity, by which the Eſſenes made ſo many converts.

I have already obſerved that beſide Apollos, twelve other perſons, came to Epheſus, who had been baptized only according to the baptiſm of John. St. Paul on his arrival there baptized them in the name of Jeſus, and imparted to them the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, of which till that time they had no knowledge. From this laſt circumſtance one might almoſt conclude that theſe perſons had lived in ſome deſert place: for whoever has been baptized, and taught to expect the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, muſt have heard of their actual communication within the courſe of twenty years after Chriſt's aſcenſion, unleſs a total retirement from the world had cut off all means of information. Perhaps theſe twelve diſciples were Egyptian hermits: or poſſibly they had ſpent the former part of their lives in the deſert of Judæa, where John had baptized. Now the deſert of Judæa, as well as the deſert of Egypt, was a place of reſort for the Eſſenes, who, according to Pliny, were very numerous in the neighbourhood of Engeddi, near the Dead ſea. It is therefore very probable that they were either Eſſenes themſelves, or at leaſt that they had imbibed the principles of this ſect. Now ſince Apollos and theſe twelve perſons were the firſt converts to Chriſtianity at Epheſus, we ſee in what manner the Eſſene tenets were introduced into

the Ephesian church. I will not accuse them of an actual design of propagating heresy: on the contrary, I am persuaded that, after they had been fully instructed, and had received spiritual gifts, they embraced Christianity with great sincerity. But, as it is extremely difficult to eradicate entirely the principles in which we have been educated, it is not extraordinary that Essene notions were disseminated in a community, of which men attached to this sect were the earliest and principal members.

Further, it is not impossible, though till further proof be given, it cannot be asserted as a fact, that the Jewish exorcists mentioned Acts xix. 13. who, during St. Paul's residence at Ephesus, attempted to cast out evil spirits by invoking 'the Lord Jesus whom Paul preached,' were likewise Essenes. For it is well known that the Essenes applied themselves to superstitious arts, and pretended to have converse with spirits. Some of them laid claim to the gift of prophecy, of which we find many instances in Josephus: others healed diseases, and as Josephus expressly mentions, made use of herbs for that purpose, with the virtues of which they thought themselves better acquainted than others. Now we know that the Jews ascribed almost all diseases to the influence of evil spirits. To cure a disease therefore was, according to their notions, to expel an evil spirit: and it appears from the relation of Josephus[s], that it was one of their modes of expulsion to apply a ring to the nose of the diseased person, and to use a certain root, supposed to possess a magic power. Such arts are well suited to the manner of life and principles of the Essenes. On the other hand it is not impossible that these exorcists were Pharisees, who likewise entertained these notions of exorcism, as appears from Matth. xii. 24—27. That the Jewish exorcists at Ephesus therefore were Essenes, I advance only as a conjecture, and as a subject of further consideration.

[s] Bell. Jud. Lib. VII. 2—23.

CHAP. XVI.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

SECT. I.

Of the date and occaſion of this Epiſtle: and of Tertius, who acted as St. Paul's amanuenſis in committing it to writing.

THE Epiſtle to the Romans was written after St. Paul's arrival at Corinth, and at the time, when he was preparing to go to Jeruſalem with the ſupplies, which had been collected in Macedonia and at Corinth[a]. It was written therefore toward the end of the year 58. The journey of Phœbe from Corinth to Rome afforded St. Paul an opportunity of writing to the Roman Chriſtians; but the motive, which induced him to write, was the conſideration of his duty, as an Apoſtle of the Gentiles, to inſtruct in the principal doctrines of Chriſtianity the Roman community, which had been hitherto viſited by no Apoſtle. As it was the cuſtom of the Jews to corrupt the Goſpel of Chriſt by various additions, St. Paul had reaſon to apprehend, that the Romans would be doubtful whom they ſhould believe, ſince they had not received the Goſpel from any Apoſtle immediately commiſſioned by Chriſt. He therefore found it neceſſary to lay before them a ſhort abſtract of the principal truths of the Goſpel, which were in danger of miſrepreſentation.

He dictated this Epiſtle to an amanuenſis, whoſe name was Tertius, as appears from ch. xvi. 22. Some commentators have conjectured that this Tertius was the ſame perſon as Silas, becauſe שלש in Hebrew ſignifies 'three.' But this Hebrew word would be expreſſed

[a] Rom. xv. 25—27, xvi. 1.

expreſſed in Greek by Σαλος, not by Σιλας: nor does שלש any where occur as a proper name. Beſides, as Tertius is a well known Latin name, it is wholly foreign to the purpoſe to ſeek for a Hebrew etymology. Silas appears likewiſe to be a Latin name, and a contraction of Silvanus: ſo that between Tertius and Silas there is no connexion whatever. In fact the attempt to identify Tertius either with Silas or with any other perſon, is very extraordinary, ſince no reaſon can be aſſigned why Tertius ſhould not be conſidered as having had a ſeparate exiſtence for himſelf. La Croze hazarded a different conjecture, though of a ſimilar kind, and contended that Tertius was nothing more than a name of St. Paul, who bore the three names of Saulus, Paulus, and Tertius[1]. In ch. xvi. 22. is 'I Tertius, who wrote this Epiſtle, ſalute you in the Lord.' Now if St. Paul himſelf had been here meant, it would have been ſufficient to have ſaid, 'I ſalute you,' without any name: or if it was neceſſary to expreſs a name, ſurely that would have been uſed, by which the Apoſtle was already known to the Romans, and the paſſage would have run thus, 'I Paul ſalute you.' Beſides, as St. Paul had already ſaluted the Romans, ver. 16. a ſalutation in his own name in ver. 22. would have been wholly ſuperfluous. We may reſt ſatisfied therefore with knowing that the perſon to whom St. Paul dictated his Epiſtle to the Romans was called Tertius: and it is totally uſeleſs to aſk any further queſtions about him, for they never can receive an anſwer.

[1] Leſt the reader ſhould doubt, whether ſo great a man as La Croze could advance ſuch a conjecture, I requeſt him to conſult F. W. Roloff's diſſertation, De tribus Pauli nominibus, printed at Jena in 1731.

SECT. II.

Of the foundation of the church at Rome, and its firſt teachers.

THE foundation of the church at Rome, appears not to have been laid by an Apoſtle. St. Paul had never been at Rome, when he wrote his Epiſtle to the Romans, as he himſelf ſays, ch. i. 13.: and that St. Peter converted the Romans to Chriſtianity, and then reſided among them as their biſhop, has in modern times been ſufficiently exploded as an empty fable. It is impoſſible that St. Peter could have been in Rome either before St. Paul wrote his Epiſtle to the Romans, or even before St. Paul himſelf came thither. For had he been there when St. Paul wrote to the Romans, his name would certainly have appeared in the liſt of ſalutations to the principal members of the Roman community. And if he had been at Rome, when St. Paul arrived there, a ſalutation would have been ſent from him, as an immediate Apoſtle of Chriſt, in the Epiſtles, which St. Paul wrote from Rome. Beſides, in Col. iv. 10—11. St. Paul mentions thoſe of the circumciſion, who were his fellow-labourers at Rome, in preaching the Goſpel: but he ſays not a ſingle word of St. Peter, whoſe name in that place eſpecially could not have been omitted, if St. Peter had been in Rome.

Among thoſe who were preſent at the effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt on the day of Pentecoſt, which followed Chriſt's aſcenſion, we find ſome 'ſtrangers of Rome[a].' That theſe perſons, who expreſſed a devout admiration of what they had ſeen and heard, related the whole on their return to Italy, and made known the doctrines of Chriſtianity in their own country is highly probable.

[a] Acts ii. 10.

probable. After this, many Chriſtians, who had been converted elſewhere, may be ſuppoſed on their journey to the capital of the world to have communicated ſtill further knowledge of Chriſtianity, and in this manner to have laid the foundation of a Chriſtian community in Rome. Indeed it is certain, from the ſixteenth chapter of St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Romans, that there were many firm Chriſtians at that time in Rome, with whom St. Paul had been acquainted in other places. Among theſe are particularly to be noted,

1. Aquilas and Priſcilla, who had attended St. Paul ſeveral years partly at Corinth, partly at Epheſus, who had inſtructed Apollos in the doctrine of Chriſt, and who, on their return to Rome, made their own houſe a place of aſſembly for a part of the Chriſtian community in that city, ver. 3—5.

2. Andronicus and Junius, who had formerly been fellow-priſoners with St. Paul on account of the Goſpel, and had been converted to Chriſtianity before him, ver. 7. St. Paul calls them perſons 'of note among the Apoſtles,' by which he means not Apoſtles of Chriſt, but Apoſtles, or envoys from Chriſtian communities *. As they were Jews by birth, it is not improbable that they were deputed to Rome from the church at Jeruſalem, in order to eſtabliſh the Jewiſh converts at Rome in the Chriſtian doctrines, and to preach the Goſpel.

3. Rufus, ver. 13. whoſe father had aſſiſted in carrying the croſs of Chriſt, Mark xv. 21.

4. The Chriſtian religion had been received in ſome of the principal houſes in Rome, for inſtance in thoſe of Ariſtobulus and Narciſſus, ver. 10—11. It is true, that the maſters of the families are not ſaluted, but only thoſe of the houſhold: but under theſe we muſt not reckon merely abject ſlaves according to the modern acceptation of this term, for in the great houſes at Rome they, who

* See my firſt Note to the Epiſtle to the Galatians. Compare alſo 2 Cor. viii. 23. Philipp. ii. 25. Acts xv. 25.

who bore this name were frequently men of great importance. Of Ariſtobulus we have no knowledge: but Narciſſus, whoſe houſhold St. Paul ſalutes, is perhaps the ſame perſon as the freedman of Claudius of this name, who ſtood in high eſtimation with the Emperor, and was appointed his cabinet-ſecretary. The moral character of this man was not the beſt, and therefore it was no loſs to Chriſtianity, that he was not among the members of the Chriſtian community in Rome.

Under theſe circumſtances, it is not extraordinary that, when St. Paul wrote his Epiſtle to the Romans, Chriſtianity was in a flouriſhing ſtate there. But, as they had hitherto received a viſit from no Apoſtle, none of them could have received the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, except thoſe who had been either at Jeruſalem, or in other places where Apoſtles reſided. For this reaſon St. Paul ſays, ch. i. 11. that he longed to ſee them, that he might impart to them ſome ſpiritual gifts[x].

SECT. III.

Of the falſe notions, which ſome of the Jews entertained concerning Juſtification.

IN the Epiſtle to the Romans St. Paul alludes very little to local circumſtances, becauſe he had never been in Rome, and was therefore leſs acquainted with their peculiar ſituation, than with the ſituation of thoſe communities, which he himſelf had founded. It is properly a didactic or doctrinal Epiſtle, and will be beſt underſtood by knowing what erroneous notions the Jews had of juſtification, and of the election of their nation, and how they were affected toward the Roman magiſtrates.

[x] See my note to 2 Tim. i. 6. In the commentary on the Epiſtle to the Romans, which I intend to publiſh, more will be ſaid on this ſubject, in the note to the paſſage in queſtion.

trates. We are more concerned at preſent with the erroneous, than with the right notions of the Jews: yet we muſt not conſider the errors, which we have now to examine, as common to the whole nation, for even in the Talmud we ſometimes find remains of the moſt orthodox theology. They were chiefly maintained by the moſt zealous among the Phariſees, eſpecially by thoſe who were attached to the party of Judas Galilæus.

In regard to the doctrine of juſtification it muſt be previouſly obſerved, that not even the Phariſees or any Jew whatſoever who was conſidered as orthodox, underſtood it in ſuch a manner, as to denote that a man could be juſtified by a perfect obedience to the law. The whole Jewiſh church unanimouſly confeſſed that no man was exempt from ſin. This therefore could not poſſibly be the doctrine combated by St. Paul. Nor could any Jew, who paſſed for orthodox in Paleſtine, have imagined that his former ſins were forgiven, merely in conſequence of his endeavours to lead a new life: for he knew that God had appointed ſacrifice for ſins, and had promiſed forgiveneſs in conſequence of the ſacrifice. It could not therefore be the deſign of St. Paul to ſhew, that we may obtain remiſſion of ſins by a ſubſequent courſe of piety, and obedience to the moral law. Indeed, had this been his deſign, he would have been at a loſs for arguments to prove it.

The Jews aſſigned three grounds of juſtification.

1. 'The extraordinary piety and merits of their anceſtors, and the covenant made by God with thoſe holy men.' Among theſe holy anceſtors they reckoned not only Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, according to Scripture, but likewiſe the twelve patriarchs, though the actions of ſome of theſe twelve patriarchs, according to the relation of Moſes, were of ſuch a kind, as would have been puniſhed in the preſent age with impriſonment, or even with death. Very unreaſonable terms were thus offered to the deity, in order to claim juſtification. Further, they thought the piety of their early anceſtors ſo very extraordinary, and conſidered the painful circumciſion of

Abraham

Abraham in his advanced age ſo meritorious a work, without any obligation from the law of nature, that God could not hate the children of ſuch pious parents. And, as God had made a covenant with Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, and had promiſed to bleſs their proſperity, it was thought that this covenant obliged him to forgive their ſins. I will quote a few paſſages to this purpoſe, which I have partly collected myſelf, and partly have borrowed from Whitby.

We read in Hoſ. iii. 2. 'I have bought her (the woman whom Hoſea married, and who was ſuppoſed to be a type of the people of Iſrael) to me for fifteen pieces of ſilver, for a homer[y] of barley, and a half-homer of barley.' On this paſſage Kimchi comments thus. 'Some interpret this of the merits of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, and the twelve patriarchs.' And of the homer and half-homer he ſays, 'Theſe are fifteen ephahs, which denote Moſes, Aaron, Miriam, and the twelve patriarchs.'

Pococke, in his Miſcellanea, p. 170, 227, has ſhewn, that the Jews believed, that the fire of hell had no effect on any one of their nation, becauſe Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob came down to deliver them. This ſuperſtitious notion has been adopted from the Jews by the Mohammedans, who in contradiction to the Koran believe that at the day of judgement, Chriſt, David, and Moſes, will by their interceſſion deliver thoſe from hell, who have believed in their doctrine, even after it had been aboliſhed by Mohammed. One of the principal maxims of the Jews is כל ישראל יש להם חלק לעולם הבא, that is, 'all Iſrael partakes of eternal life:' and with this maxim begins the book called Pirke Aboth. Another of the Jewiſh doctrines is, 'God promiſed to Abraham, that if his children were wicked, he would conſider them as righteous on account of the ſweet odour of his circumciſed foreſkin[z].'

The

y A homer contained ten epaphs.

z Pugio fidei, P. III. Diſ. III. cap. 16. ſect. 36—37.

The ſame is objected to the Jews by Juſtin Martyr[a]; 'Your Rabbins deceive themſelves and us in imagining that the kingdom of heaven is prepared for all thoſe, who are the natural ſeed of Abraham, even though they be ſinners and unbelievers.'

The Jews even go ſo far as to pray in the name of their anceſtors, whoſe merits they plead before God. The words of the Hebrew, Pſalm lxxxiv. 9. which ſignify literally, 'Behold our ſhield,' are rendered in the Chaldee paraphraſe 'Behold the merits of our fathers:' and the words of Iſaiah, ch. xliv. 5. 'another ſhall call himſelf by the name of Jacob,' are tranſlated both by Jonathan and in the Septuagint 'He ſhall pray in the name of Jacob.' See alſo what Wetſtein has ſaid on this ſubject in his note to Matth. iii. 9.

St. Paul, in the ninth chapter of his Epiſtle to the Romans, has given a complete confutation of this erroneous notion, and has ſhewn that the promiſes of God were not made to all, but only to the faithful deſcendants of Abraham. The latter half of the fifth chapter is likewiſe to the ſame purpoſe, where St. Paul confirms the aſſertion, which he made ch. iii. 29—30. that God was equally the God of the Jews and of the Gentiles: and ſhews that, as all men, both Jews and Gentiles, incurred death by the guilt of one common father, or head of his covenant with mankind, whom they did not elect, but receive from God, ſo it is juſt that, when God determined to have mercy, he ſhould reſtore life both to Jews and Gentiles by the common head of the new covenant.

2. Another ground of juſtification, according to the opinion of the Jews, was 'the knowledge, which they had of God through the law of Moſes, and their diligence in the ſtudy of that law.' Now it is true that in one reſpect the Jews had an advantage above the Gentiles: but then they eſtimated this advantage ſo highly, as to make it a plea for the remiſſion of their ſins. St. Paul therefore found it neceſſary to prove at large in the ſecond chapter, that man is juſtified, not by the knowledge, but by the obſervance of the law.

3. A

[a] Page 369.

3. A third ground of juſtification was 'the works of the Levitical law,' which were to expiate ſin. Among theſe works they reckoned ſacrifices, to which God had promiſed remiſſion of ſins, and circumciſion. In oppoſition to this St. Paul teaches, that the Levitical law does not expiate, but only reveal ſin; and that it exemplifies on the ſacrificed beaſts the puniſhment, which is due to the ſinner, ch. iii. 20. v. 20.

The inference, which the Jews deduced from the preceding doctrines, is obvious, namely, that they had much eaſier acceſs to juſtification, than the Gentiles; and that the Gentiles, if they wiſhed to be juſtified and be ſaved, muſt receive the law of Moſes.

SECT. IV.

Of the notions entertained by the Jews concerning Election.

THE queſtion relative to predeſtination and election, which St. Paul diſcuſſes in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of the Epiſtle to the Romans, is totally different from that, which has engaged the attention of Chriſtians from the time of Auguſtin, and ſeparates at preſent the Lutheran from the Calviniſt church. The greateſt confuſion therefore would be occaſioned in the ſtudy of the Epiſtle to the Romans, if we applied to the modern controverſy on predeſtination and election what St. Paul has written in this Epiſtle againſt the Jewiſh notions, which had no reſemblance to any of the opinions maintained by Chriſtian polemics. God had promiſed Abraham to bleſs his ſeed, to give it not only the true and ſpiritual bleſſing, but likewiſe the land of Canaan, to ſuffer it to dwell there in proſperity, and to conſider it as his church upon earth. This promiſe the Jews extended to their whole nation, and aſſerted that God was bound to fulfil it toward every Jew, as being a

deſcendant of Abraham, whatever his principles, or whatever his conduct might be. This pretenſion was not only groundleſs, but inconſiſtent: for the Iſhmaelites and the Edomites were equally deſcended from Abraham, and yet the Jews themſelves acknowledged that theſe had no claim to the divine promiſes, eſpecially to the promiſe of the land of Canaan. Nor could they deny, that in the time of Iſaiah the greateſt part of their nation had been deſtroyed by the Aſſyrians, without any violation of the promiſes which had been made to them. Hence St. Paul argues in the ninth chapter, that God would ſtill adhere to his promiſes, if he received only thoſe as the choſen ſeed, who believed in Chriſt, and condemned all thoſe who diſbelieved.

The Jews went even ſo far as to aſſert that, if a prophet, were inſpired with prophecies unfavourable to their nation, he ought not to pronounce them, and that he was bound to reſiſt the will of God, by praying, like Moſes, that his name might rather be expunged from the book of the living. It was on this account, that St. Paul, in the five firſt verſes of the ninth chapter, makes ſo cautious and almoſt timorous a tranſition to the queſtion, which he was going to diſcuſs.

As it may appear incredible, that ſuch doctrines could be maintained by the Jews, I will briefly quote what Kimchi has written as an explanation of Hoſ. i. 2. 'Our Rabbies relate on occaſion of the words, *and the Lord ſaid to Hoſea*, that the Holy and Ever-bleſſed ſaid to Hoſea, the Iſraelites have ſinned.' He ought to have anſwered, O Lord of the world, they are thy children, the children of thy choſen, the children of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob; have mercy on them. But he not only neglected to ſpeak thus, but even ſaid the whole world is thine, exchange them for another people.

'Then the Holy and Ever-bleſſed ſaid, what ſhall I do with this old man? I will ſay to him, take thee a harlot: and again I will ſay to him, put her away from thee.' If he can do this, I will alſo ſeparate myſelf from Iſrael[b].

Now,

[b] It is to be obſerved that in the mean time Hoſea propheſied for ſome years againſt the Iſraelites, till three children were born to him.

Now, after ſhe had brought him forth two ſons and a daughter, the Holy and Ever-bleſſed ſaid to him, Hoſea, oughteſt thou not to learn from thy maſter, Moſes? After I had ſpoken to him, he ſeparated himſelf from his wife: do thou alſo ſeparate thyſelf from thine. Hoſea, anſwered, O Lord of the world, I have children by her, and cannot poſſibly put her away. Then ſaid the Holy and Ever-bleſſed, canſt thou not do this, Hoſea, though ſhe is an harlot, and thy children are the children of an harlot? So alſo is it with me: the children of Iſrael are my children, the children of my choſen, of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, and they are one of my three poſſeſſions, and yet thou haſt ſaid, exchange them for another people.

'As ſoon as Hoſea perceived that he had ſinned, he begged for mercy. But the Holy and Ever-bleſſed ſpake: when thou prayeſt for mercy, pray for mercy on Iſrael. From that moment he began to bleſs, and ſaid: the number of the children of Iſrael ſhall be as the ſand of the ſea[c].'

Theſe Jewiſh errors illuſtrate at once the very difficult ninth chapter of the Epiſtle to the Romans, in which St. Paul had no other object in view, than to ſhew, that God was not obliged to beſtow happineſs here and hereafter on the unbelieving Jews; and that he could as well permit them to harden their hearts, and provoke his judgments, without violating his word, as he had formerly done in regard to Pharaoh.

SECT. V.

Of the ſentiments of the Jews, concerning obedience to the Roman Emperor.

IT is well known that the Phariſees, at leaſt thoſe of the party of Judas Galilæus, were not well affected to foreign magiſtrates, and that from a falſe interpretation of

[c] This whole ſtory is taken from the book ספרא, Chap. Haiſha,

of Deut. xvii. 15. they thought it unlawful to pay tribute to the Roman Emperor, and to acknowledge him for their ſovereign[d]. And as the Jews in general expected a Meſſiah who would eſtabliſh a temporal kingdom, and free them from the dominion of the Romans[e], this expectation made them ripe for rebellion, and ready at all times to throw of the yoke. Even the Jews at Rome had already begun to create diſturbances, which occaſioned the command of the Emperor Claudius, that all the Jews ſhould leave Rome, of which mention is briefly made by St. Luke, in Acts xviii. 2. Suetonius, in his Life of Claudius, ch. 25, writes, 'Judæos, impulſore Chreſto, aſſidue tumultuantes[f] Roma expulit.' By 'Chreſtus' Suetonius meant 'Chriſtus', not knowing the meaning of the word, and ſuppoſing, that it was written in Greek Χρηστος. Yet he certainly did not ſpeak of the Chriſtians, and intend to accuſe the followers of Jeſus Chriſt of ſedition: for they ſubmitted peaceably to the Roman magiſtrates, and even if they had been inclined to ſedition, they were not ſufficiently numerous, nor ſufficiently powerful at Rome in the time of Claudius to make the leaſt oppoſition. By 'Judæi' therefore we muſt underſtand Jews in the ſtrict ſenſe of the word: and 'Chreſtus' that is, 'Chriſtus,' denotes, not the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, but the Meſſiah expected by the Jews, and which they called in Greek Χριστος, and in Latin 'Chriſtus.' The Jews therefore being excited to ſedition from an expectation of ſupport from their 'Chriſtus,' Claudius and his miniſters imagined that this was a real perſon then living in ſome place out of Rome, who excited the Jews to inſurrection. This is what Suetonius meant in deſcribing them as 'impulſore Chreſto tumultuantes.' However the baniſhment, which followed this inſurrection, appears not to have laſted long,

[d] Compare Matth. xxii. 15—22. with Joſeph. Antiq. Lib. XVII. c. 2.

[e] Joſeph. Bell. Jud. Lib. VII. 31. Suetonius in Veſpaſ. cap. 4. Taciti Hiſt. Lib. II. 5.

[f] See Geſner's Theſaurus, under the word Tumultus.

long, and it either terminated with the death of Claudius, or the decree was revoked during his life: for Aquilas the Jew, who met St. Paul at Corinth, after he had left Rome in conſequence of this decree, was already returned to Rome, when St. Paul wrote his Epiſtle to the Romans. From what has been ſaid in this paragraph, it is obvious how neceſſary thoſe exhortations to obedience were, which the Apoſtle has given in the thirteenth chapter.

Whoever is converſant with the Roman hiſtory, will be able to illuſtrate many ſingle paſſages in this chapter. The city of Rome contained within itſelf the ſeeds of inſurrection and civil war, and was frequently involved in troubles, even when the provinces were at peace. The Senate was ſecretly jealous of the Emperor, and the Emperor in his turn ſuſpected the Senate. The life of the Emperor was ſeldom free from danger: Caligula had died a violent death, Claudius had been poiſoned, and Nero, who was on the throne, when St. Paul wrote this Epiſtle, did not meet with a more fortunate end. The inferior magiſtrates aſpired to the ſupremacy: and as the Romans then believed in aſtrology, which they had learned from the Chaldees, an aſtrologer had only to predict ſucceſs to the aſpiring party, or to foretel the day, on which the Emperor would die, and the conſequence was a certain aſſaſſination. The imperial life-guard, which conſiſted of foreigners, eſpecially of Germans, and therefore was not intereſted in the proſperity of the Empire, was not only an object of diſguſt to the Roman citizens, but became ſo powerful after the time of Claudius, that the Emperors were obliged to purchaſe its favour by conſiderable preſents. And in fact they had no other right to their ſovereignty over the Romans, than that which they derived either from force or intrigue. Under theſe circumſtances, St. Paul judged it neceſſary to exhort the Roman Chriſtians to ſubmit peaceably to the government, under which they lived. He tells them that 'the powers that be (αι δυναμεις εξουσιαι) are ordained of God:' he will not conſent, that

they ſhould enter into any inquiries on the origin of that right, which was exerciſed by the Emperor, but commands them to obey the conſtituted authorities, as appointed agreeably to the divine will, and not to aſſociate with thoſe, who endeavoured to effect a change in the government [g].

SECT. VI.

Contents of the Epiſtle to the Romans.

THE contents of the Epiſtle to the Romans may be reduced to the following heads:

1. The uſual ſalutation, with which the Greeks began their letters, ch. i. 1—7. On this occaſion, St. Paul particularly deſcribes his apoſtolical office, becauſe the authority of this Epiſtle depended on it.

2. St. Paul endeavours, ch. i. 8—16. to pave the way for the ſubject, which he is about to diſcuſs. He expreſſes his joy at the flouriſhing ſtate of the Chriſtian community in Rome, and his deſire to come thither, and preach the Goſpel, of which he was not aſhamed, in the face of the whole world. After this he inſenſibly introduces the principal point, which he intended to prove, namely,

3. The ſubject of the Goſpel, ver. 16, 17. This reveals a righteouſneſs unknown before, which is derived ſolely from faith, and to which the Jews and Gentiles have an equal claim.

4. In order to prove this point he ſhews, ch. i. 18.—iii. 26, that both Jews and Gentiles are under ſin, that is, that God will impute their ſins to Jews, as well as to Gentiles. Here, it muſt not be imagined, that St. Paul meant

[g] Qui res novas moliuntur, according to the phraſe uſed by the Romans.

meant by a chain of concluſions to prove, what every man's experience will ſuggeſt to him, that Jews and Gentiles have ſinned: his intention was to prove that God will call the Jews to an account for their ſins, and conſequently, that they ſtand in need of juſtification by faith.

His proof of this poſition may be reduced to the following ſyllogiſms. 'The wrath of God is revealed againſt thoſe, who hold the truth in unrighteouſneſs, that is, who acknowledge the truth and yet ſin againſt it, ch. i. 18.

"The Gentiles acknowledged truths, but partly by their idolatry, and partly by their other deteſtable vices they ſinned againſt the truths, which they acknowledged, ch. i. 19—31.

'Therefore the wrath of God is revealed againſt the Gentiles, and puniſhes them.

'The Jews have acknowledged more truths than the Gentiles, and yet they ſin, ch. ii. 1. 17—24.

'Therefore the Jewiſh ſinners are ſtill more expoſed to the wrath of God,' ch. ii. 1—12.

Having thus proved his point he anſwers the following objections, which might be made to it.

Obj. 1. 'The Jews were well grounded in their knowledge, and ſtudied the law.' St. Paul anſwers; If a knowledge of the law, without the performance of it, could juſtify, God would not have condemned the Gentiles, who knew the law by nature, ch. ii. 13—16.

Obj. 2. 'The Jews were circumciſed.' Anſwer. That is, they were admitted by an outward ſign to a covenant with God: but this ſign will not avail thoſe, who violate the covenant, ch. ii. 25—29.

Obj. 3. 'According to this doctrine of St. Paul, the Jews have no advantages above the Gentiles, which is manifeſtly falſe.' Anſwer. They ſtill have advantages, for to them were committed the oracles of God: but their privileges do not extend ſo far, that God ſhould overlook their ſins, which the Scripture earneſtly condemns even in Jews, ch. iii. 1—19.

Obj. 4. 'They had the Levitical law, and ſacrifices.' Anſwer. Hence is no remiſſion, but only the knowledge of ſin [b],' ch. iii. 20.

5. From the preceding arguments St. Paul infers that Jews and Gentiles muſt be juſtified by the ſame means, namely, without the Levitical law, through faith in Chriſt: and in oppoſition to the imaginary advantages of the Jews, he ſtates the declaration of Zechariah, that God is not the God of the Jews only, but alſo of the Gentiles, ch. iii. 21—31.

6. As the whole bleſſing was promiſed to thoſe, who were the faithful deſcendants of Abraham, whom both Scripture and the Jews call his children, he proves his former aſſertion from the example of Abraham; who was an idolater before his call, but was declared juſt by God, on account of his faith, long before his circumciſion. Hence St. Paul takes occaſion to explain the nature, and the fruits of faith, ch. iv. 1.—v. 11.

7. He proceeds to prove from the equity of God, that the Jews had no advantages above the Gentiles, in reſpect to juſtification. Both Jews and Gentiles had foretold life and immortality, through the common father of the human race, whom they themſelves had not choſen as their repreſentative. If therefore it was the will of God to reſtore immortality by a new ſpiritual head of a covenant, which was Chriſt, it was equitable that Jews and Gentiles ſhould have an equal ſhare in the advantages to be derived from this new repreſentative of the human race, ch. v. 12—21.

8. He ſhews, that the doctrine of juſtification, as he had ſtated it, lays us under the ſtricteſt obligations to holineſs, ch. vi. 1—23.

9. He ſhews that ſince the death of Chriſt we are no longer concerned with the law of Moſes. For our juſtification ariſes from our appearing in the ſight of God, as if we were actually dead with Chriſt on account of our ſins: but the law of Moſes was not given to the dead. On this occaſion he evinces at large, that the preceding conſideration

[b] See my Note on Gal. iii. 19.

conſideration does not affect the eternal power of God over us, and that while we are under the law of Moſes, we become perpetually ſubject to death, even for ſins of inadvertency, ch. vii. 1—25.

10. From theſe premiſes he concludes, that all thoſe, and thoſe only, who are united with Chriſt, and for the ſake of this union live not according to the fleſh, are free from the condemnation of the law, and have an undoubted right to eternal life, ch. viii. 1—17.

11. Having deſcribed the happineſs of all ſuch perſons, he is aware that the Jews, who expected temporal bleſſings, would object to him, that the Chriſtians, notwithſtanding what he had ſaid, ſtill endured many ſufferings in this world. This objection he obviates, ch. viii. 18—39.

12. He ſhews, that God is not the leſs true and faithful, becauſe he does not juſtify, but rather rejects and puniſhes the Jews, who would not believe in the Meſſiah, ch. ix. x. xi. His diſcourſe on this ſubject is arranged as follows:

A. The introduction, in which he diſplays the utmoſt caution, ch. ix. 1—5.

B. The diſſertation itſelf, which conſiſts of three principal parts.

a). St. Paul ſhews that the promiſes of God were never made to all the poſterity of Abraham: that God always reſerved to himſelf the power of chooſing thoſe ſons of Abraham, whom for Abraham's ſake he intended to bleſs, and of puniſhing the wicked ſons of Abraham: and that in reſpect to temporal happineſs or miſery, even their good or ill conduct did not determine his choice. Thus Iſhmael, Eſau, the Iſraelites in the deſert in the time of Moſes, and the greater part of that nation in the time of Iſaiah, were rejected and made a ſacrifice of his juſtice, ch. ix. 6—29.

b.) He ſhews, that God had reaſon to reject moſt of the Jews then living, becauſe they would not believe

believe in the Meſſiah, though the Goſpel had been plainly preached to them, ch. ix. 30.—x. 21.

c). Yet God rejected not all his people, but was ſtill fulfilling his promiſes on many thouſand natural deſcendants of Abraham, who believed in the Meſſiah, and at a future period would fulfil them upon more, ſince all Iſrael would be converted, ch. xi. 11—32.

C. The concluſion, in which the Apoſtle expreſſes his admiration of the wiſe counſels of God, ch. xi. 33—36.

13. From the doctrines hitherto laid down, and particularly from this, that God has in his mercy accepted the Gentiles, he argues that the Romans ſhould conſecrate and offer themſelves wholly to God. This leads him to mention in particular ſome Chriſtian duties, ch. xii.

14. He exhorts them to be ſubject to the magiſtrates, ch. xiii. 1—7.

15. He recommends brotherly love, ver. 8—10.

16. He commands them to abſtain from thoſe vices, which the heathens conſidered as matters indifferent, ver. 11—14.

17. He exhorts the Jews and Gentiles in the Chriſtian church to brotherly unity, ch. xiv. 1—xv. 3. The Chriſtian community in Rome appears to have been divided into parties, who purpoſely aſſembled in ſeparate places of worſhip. But on this ſubject I ſhall ſay more, in my Notes to this Epiſtle.

18. He concludes, with an apology for having ventured to admoniſh the Romans, whom he had not converted; with an account of his intended journey to Jeruſalem; and with ſalutations to thoſe perſons, whom he intended to recommend to public notice, ch. xv. 14.—xvi. 27. In reſpect to the ſalutations, it will be neceſſary to make the following remark:

When St. Paul deſires a Chriſtian community to ſalute certain members in his name, he thereby inſinuates that he eſteems thoſe perſons as his particular friends, and recommends

recommends them to the church. In the Epiſtle to the Romans this appears more clearly than in any other of St. Paul's Epiſtles: for he not only beſtows particular commendations on moſt of thoſe, whom he ſalutes, but in the midſt of his ſalutations he introduces a warning againſt thoſe, whoſe ſociety was to be avoided, ch. xvi. 17—20. Hence we ſee, that not even the ſalutations in St. Paul's Epiſtles were unworthy of a divine inſpiration, or the direction of the Holy Spirit.

CHAP. XVII.

GENERAL REMARKS ON SOME OF THE EPISTLES WRITTEN BY ST. PAUL DURING HIS IMPRISONMENT IN ROME; AND ON THE IMPRISONMENT ITSELF.

SECT. I.

The Epiſtles to the Epheſians, Coloſſians, and Philemon, were written by St. Paul, while he was priſoner in Rome, and were diſpatched at the ſame time.

AFTER St. Paul had written his Epiſtle to the Romans, he went to Jeruſalem, where he was apprehended by the Jews, and was with difficulty reſcued by the Roman guard. On this occaſion however he was deprived of his liberty, and after a tedious impriſonment was ſent to Rome, where he arrived in the ſpring of the year 61. During his confinement in Rome, which was not a very cloſe one, he wrote about the ſame time his Epiſtles to the Epheſians, to the Coloſſians, to Philemon, and alſo that to the Philippians. This circumſtance of time it will be neceſſary to prove.

That the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians was diſpatched at the ſame time with the Epiſtle to Philemon, is evident from

from Col. iv. 9. Oneſimus, a ſlave who had deſerted his maſter Philemon, was converted by St. Paul then a priſoner in Rome, and ſent back to his maſter with a letter from the Apoſtle. Now St. Paul ſays to the Coloſſians, ch. iv. 7—9. 'All my ſtate ſhall Tychicus declare unto you, who is a beloved brother, and a faithful miniſter and fellow ſervant in the Lord: whom I have ſent unto you for the ſame purpoſe, that ye might know your eſtate, and comfort your hearts, with Oneſimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you. They ſhall make known unto you all things, which are done here.' It is certain therefore that St. Paul wrote the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians immediately before the departure of Oneſimus from Rome, and therefore at the ſame time, that he wrote to Philemon. Between the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians and that to the Epheſians there is ſo great a ſimilarity, not only in the ſentiments, but in the very expreſſions, that we muſt conclude they were written about the ſame time, or ſo near to each other, that the expreſſions, which the Apoſtle had uſed in the former, were freſh in his memory, when he wrote the latter[i]. Further, the circumſtances attending both Epiſtles

[i] To this argument, which other commentators have uſed before me, Dr. Lardner in his Supplement, Vol. II. p. 214—216. makes the three following objections, which in my opinion do not weaken its force.

1. 'It is likely that the Apoſtle kept copies of his letters. If ſo, it might be eaſy for him to write after the ſame manner at different times, to people not very remote from each other, and whoſe circumſtances were much alike. Indeed without keeping copies of his letters, it would be no difficult matter for St. Paul to repeat the Chriſtian principles, and exhortations to Chriſtian virtues, in like expreſſions, if the circumſtances required it.

Anſ. That this would have afforded no difficulty to St. Paul, if he had actually deſigned it, I readily grant: but I cannot conceive what end it could have anſwered, deſignedly to have uſed the ſame expreſſions in two different letters. Agreement in expreſſions ariſes ſeldom from a real intention, but generally from the circumſtance, that thoſe which we have uſed laſt, preſent themſelves unſought, and ſometimes againſt our inclination, when we again write on the ſame ſubject.

2. 'Though there is a reſemblance between theſe two Epiſtles, they are very different. For the Epiſtle to the Epheſians is a good

Epiſtles are preciſely the ſame. Both of them were written by St. Paul as a priſoner. That this is true of the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians is evident, becauſe in his Epiſtle to Philemon, which was written at the ſame time, he ſays of Oneſimus, ver. 10. Ον εγεννησα εν τοις δεσμοις μου[k], and that he was likewiſe a priſoner when he wrote his Epiſtle to the Epheſians is certain from what the Apoſtle himſelf ſays, ch. iii. 1. iv. 1. vi. 20. But, what is ſtill more deciſive, the very ſame perſon, namely Tychicus, who carried the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, carried alſo the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, as appears from Epheſ. vi. 21. Col. iv. 7. As Epheſus lay on the ſea coaſt, and Coloſſæ at ſome diſtance from it, it is probable that Tychicus landed at Epheſus, and having delivered the Epiſtle to the Chriſtian community in that city, continued his route to Coloſſæ, in company with Oneſimus, who went with him from Rome, and is

deal longer than that to the Coloſſians: and in thoſe places, where there is an agreement, there are differences.

Anſ. This objection is foreign to the purpoſe: for when it is ſaid that expreſſions uſed in one Epiſtle occur in writing another, which is ſent at the ſame time, it is not meant that theſe two Epiſtles will be in all reſpects alike, or copies of each other.

3. 'Nor is there in the Epiſtle to the Epheſians any notice taken of Timothy, or Epaphras, or Mark, ſo expreſsly mentioned in the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians: which muſt be reckoned a very ſtrong, and even demonſtrative argument, that theſe two Epiſtles were not written and ſent away at the ſame time.'

Anſ. But this argument is no more demonſtrative, than the preceding. For St. Paul in his Epiſtle to the Epheſians has ſent no ſalutations whatever, and, therefore no inference can be drawn from the omiſſion of any one name in particular. It is true, that he might have mentioned the name of Timothy after his own, at the beginning of the Epiſtle: but various cauſes might have contributed to this omiſſion, even though Timothy were then in Rome: for inſtance, that Timothy was not the perſon to whom St. Paul dictated the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, or that Timothy had written to them himſelf, or (what is probably the true cauſe) that this Epiſtle was intended, as will appear in the ſequel, not only for the Epheſians, but for ſeveral other churches in Aſia Minor, with which Timothy was unacquainted.

[k] See alſo ver. 13.

is mentioned in the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, as the attendant of Tychicus on his journey thither.

I am ſenſible that many commentators are of a different opinion: but I hope their principal doubts are removed by what I have ſaid concerning the journey of Tychicus. Whoever wiſhes to be acquainted with what other writers have ſaid on this ſubject, and with the grounds of their opinions, may conſult the Prolegomena to the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, in Wolfii Curæ philologicæ et criticæ.

SECT. II.

Examination of the queſtion, whether St. Paul was twice priſoner in Rome: and if he was, in which of the two impriſonments theſe Epiſtles were written.

IT is the common opinion that St. Paul was twice priſoner in Rome, that the firſt ended with reſtoration to his liberty, and the ſecond with death, which he ſuffered by the ſword. If this be true, the queſtion occurs, in which of the two impriſonments did St. Paul write theſe, and ſome other Epiſtles hereafter to be mentioned[1]? But before this queſtion be examined, it is neceſſary to inquire whether the opinion, that St. Paul was twice priſoner in Rome, which many deny, is really grounded.

It muſt be admitted that no hiſtorian contemporary with St. Paul has made the leaſt mention of his having been twice in Rome, that is, of his having left Rome, at the end of the impriſonment recorded by St. Luke in the laſt chapter of the Acts, and his afterwards returning thither. The earlieſt writer, who has ſpoken of this journey,

[1] This queſtion particularly concerns the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, as will be afterwards ſhewn.

journey, is Eusebius, who lived in the fourth century; and even Eusebius gives it only as a report, for instead of relating it as an undoubted fact, he introduces it with the expression, λογος εχει. It is true that he endeavours to corroborate the report by an appeal to 2 Tim. iv. 16.: but the argument, which he builds on this passage, is without foundation. Omitting therefore his remarks, I will quote only what is to our present purpose[m]. Τοτε μεν ουν απολογησαμενον αυθις επι την του κηρυγματος διακονιαν λογος εχει γειλασθαι τον Αποστολον, δευτερον δ' επιβαντα τη αυτη πολει τω κατ' αυτον τελειωθηναι μαρτυριω, εν ω δεσμοις εχομενος την προς Τιμοθεον δευτεραν επιστολην συνταττει. 'There is a report, that the Apostle, after he had answered the charges, which had been laid to him[n], again went out to preach the Gospel[o]; but that, when he went up a second time to the same city, he finished his life with martyrdom, and that at this time he wrote in bonds the second Epistle to Timothy.' Now a fact, recorded for the first time at least two hundred and fifty years, after it is supposed to have happened, and then given only as a report, cannot be said to rest on very strong historical evidence: and when we consider the extreme zeal and activity of St. Paul's life, it must appear very extraordinary, if he left Rome after the imprisonment recorded by St. Luke in the last chapter of the Acts, took several journeys, and then returned thither again, that not even tradition should have preserved the remembrance of any one act, which he performed in this interval. It is true, that silence in regard to any fact is no proof that it did not happen: and in the present

[m] Hist. Eccles. Lib. II. cap. 22.

[n] Eusebius here means, in the imprisonment at Rome related in the last chapter of the Acts.

[o] Whither, this report of the fourth century does not say. This chasm modern writers have filled up with various conjectures, and have transported St. Paul, not only to Greece, Asia, and Crete, but likewise to Spain, and even into Britain.

preſent inſtance we may account for the ſilence of hiſtory, becauſe St. Luke, the only Chriſtian hiſtorian of that age, cloſes his accounts with the end of the ſecond year of that impriſonment, which St. Paul underwent at Rome, on coming from Cæſarea: and after that period we know nothing of what happened to the Chriſtians during many years, at leaſt not with any certainty, except from the ſcattered accounts of Tacitus and other heathen hiſtorians. Another objection to the opinion that St. Paul went a ſecond time to Rome, may be made in the following manner. If St. Paul was acquitted, when he was firſt priſoner there, what could have induced him to expoſe himſelf again to the ſame danger, eſpecially if he was acquitted in the year 65, as I ſhall ſhew in the chapter on the Epiſtle to the Philippians, for at the end of that year the Chriſtians underwent a ſevere perſecution[p]? But to this objection may be anſwered, that St. Paul had too much courage to be afraid of perſecution, and that on the contrary this very circumſtance would rather have induced him to return to Rome, in order to comfort and ſupport the brethren. Or he might come again to Rome, with a deſign of putting the plan in execution, which he had once formed, of going to Spain[q]. In ſhort, I will not deny that St. Paul really did undertake a ſecond journey to Rome, either becauſe I know that the motive, by which he was induced to it, or becauſe he would have done it at the hazard of his life.

What I have hitherto ſaid on this ſubject leaves the queſtion undecided; and if no other arguments could be brought, either on the one ſide or the other, we ſhould be obliged to confeſs our ignorance whether St. Paul was twice priſoner in Rome, or not. But though hiſtorical documents fail in this inquiry, there are certain internal marks in the Epiſtle to the Philippians, and in the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, which ſhew

[p] Tacit. Annal. xv. 44. [q] Rom. xv. 24.

shew that St Paul must have been confined in Rome at two separate periods. In the Epistle to the Philippians, which was written from Rome, St. Paul says, ch. i. 25. 26. και τουτο πεποιθως οιδα, ὁτι μενω και συμπαραμενω πασιν ὑμιν, εις την ὑμων προκοπην και χαραν της πιστεως· ἱνα το καυχημα ὑμων περισσευη εν Χριστω Ιησυ εν εμοι, δια της εμης παρουσιας παλιν προς ὑμας. Here St. Paul assures the Philippians that he intended to visit them, and speaks so confidently, using the strong expression πεποιθως οιδα, that whoever admits St. Paul's divine inspiration must conclude, that the Apostle spake here with a prophetic spirit, and consequently, that he was afterwards released from that imprisonment, in which he was then writing. The second Epistle to Timothy furnishes a stronger proof: for there are several passages in it, from which real historical arguments may be deduced. But the consideration of these arguments I shall reserve for Ch. xxii. Sect. 2.

Before I conclude this article, I must take notice however of an objection, which may be made to the opinion, that St. Paul left Rome after his first arrival there, because this objection, like the argument in the preceding paragraph, is founded on St. Paul's gift of prophecy. When the Apostle took leave of the elders of the church of Ephesus, on that journey to Jerusalem, which ended with his imprisonment, and his removal to Cæsarea, and afterwards to Rome, he said to them, 'Now behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more[s]:' on which they burst into tears, 'sorrowing for the words, that they should see his face no more[t].' Now this pathetic declaration St. Paul appears to have made in a spirit of prophecy: and therefore we must conclude, that he never did see the elders of the church of Ephesus again. But in his second Epistle to Timothy, which was written from Rome, St. Paul speaks, ch. iv. 13. 20. of his having been lately in Asia Minor. Consequently, if we assume a second imprisonment in Rome, and suppose

[s] Acts xx. 25. [t] Ver. 38.

poſe, that he was not only ſet at liberty at the end of the impriſonment related by St. Luke [t], but that he returned thither ſome years afterwards, was again impriſoned, and in *that* impriſonment wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, it neceſſarily follows, that in the interval, which elapſed between the two impriſonments, St. Paul had taken another journey into Aſia Minor, after his ſolemn farewell of the Epheſian elders. But this objection will ceaſe to be of importance, as ſoon as we reflect, that a return into Aſia Minor does not neceſſarily imply a return to the city of Epheſus in particular. Among the cities of Aſia Minor, which St. Paul in the fourth chapter of his ſecond Epiſtle, to Timothy mentions as having lately viſited, Epheſus is not named, as one of them. He ſpeaks only of Troas, and Miletus [u]: if we conclude therefore that he was likewiſe at Epheſus, the concluſion is without foundation. In his Epiſtle to the Epheſians, which was written from Rome, he gave them no promiſe that he would return to them: though in his Epiſtle to Philemon, which was written at the ſame time, he expreſſed his intention of viſiting the church at Coloſſæ, for which he was under ſome anxiety, becauſe he had never been there in perſon, and for that purpoſe deſired Philemon, ver. 22. to prepare for him a lodging. Further, in his ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, ch. iv. 20. he ſpeaks of Trophimus, who was an Epheſian, and whom he had left ſick behind him; but Trophimus was left at Miletus, not at Epheſus. We have no reaſon whatever therefore for ſuppoſing that St. Paul in travelling from Rome into Aſia Minor went to Epheſus: and conſequently his ſolemn farewell of the Epheſian elders is no argument that he never returned into any other part of that country.

[t] Acts xxviii. [u] 2 Tim. iv. 13. 20.

CHAP. XVIII.

OF THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

PHILEMON appears to have been a man of ſubſtance at Coloſſæ, who had a ſpacious houſe, in which not only a part of the Chriſtian community in that city aſſembled [w], but likewiſe travelling Chriſtians were entertained [x]. He had therefore an eccleſiaſtical office, and was deacon, when St. Paul calls him, ver. 1. his fellow-labourer. From this title, Hoffmann, in his Introduct. ad Lection. Ep. ad Coloſſenſes, § 18. concludes that Philemon was biſhop of Coloſſæ, as ſome of the ancients pretend, eſpecially the author of the work called the Apoſtolic Conſtitutions [y]. But Philemon, even as deacon, was a fellow-labourer of St. Paul: and therefore there is no neceſſity, on account of this appellation, for making him a biſhop. The aſſertion of the fathers is in this caſe of no value: for thoſe, whom they called the firſt biſhops of the Chriſtian churches, were generally biſhops of their own creation. But, ſetting this title aſide, he appears to have been one of the firſt converts in the Coloſſian community, and to have learnt the doctrines of Chriſtianity, not from Epaphras, as the other Coloſſians had done, but from St. Paul himſelf [z]. As St. Paul had not been at Coloſſæ, it is probable that Philemon came to him, while he reſided at Epheſus. Archippus, the ſon of Philemon, to whom this Epiſtle, which is of the familiar kind, is likewiſe addreſſed, had ſhortly before been appointed deacon in the church of Coloſſæ, as we ſee from Col. iv. 17. but not biſhop, as Jerom pretends. St. Paul makes honourable mention of him, and calls him, not merely his fellow-labourer, but his fellow-ſoldier.

What

[w] See my third Note to this Epiſtle.

[x] See ver. 22.

[y] Conſtit. Apoſt. Lib. VII. c. 46.

[z] Ver. 19.

What became of Oneſimus is not known: but whoever wiſhes to know what has been conjectured by various writers on this ſubject may conſult the remarks on the tenth verſe of this Epiſtle in Wolfii Curæ.

CHAP. XIX.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

SECT. I.

Of the ſituation of Coloſſæ, and the circumſtances of the Chriſtian community in that city.

COLOSSÆ was a city of Phrygia, ſituate at the conflux of the Lycus and the Meander[a]. By what name it is called at preſent, I know not: for Chonus, or Konus, which is ſuppoſed to be the ſame as Coloſſæ, is more probably the ſame as Conium mentioned by Pliny, and clearly diſtinguiſhed by him from Coloſſæ[b]. In the time of Herodotus it was a large city, and it is deſcribed as ſuch alſo by Xenophon: but in the time of St. Paul it muſt have loſt much of its ancient greatneſs, for Strabo[c] reckons it among the πολισμάτα, or ſmall towns of Phrygia, in oppoſition to the great cities, among which he places the neighbouring city Laodicea. Pliny[d] indeed reckons it among the 'oppida celeberrima Phrygiæ:' but by 'oppidum' Pliny hardly meant a great city, and if he did, his authority in

[a] In D'Anville's map of Aſia Minor, it will be found, as well as Laodicea and Hierapolis, which are mentioned in this Epiſtle, near the place where the 4, th degree of longitude croſſes the 38th degree of latitude.

[b] Pag. 290. lib. [illegible]. [c] Pag. 864, or 576. [d] Lib. V. § 41.

in points of geography is inferior to that of Strabo. Ptolemy has taken no notice of it, either in his catalogue of cities, or in his map. It is therefore much the ſmalleſt and moſt unimportant city of all thoſe, to which the Epiſtles of St. Paul now extant were addreſſed: and hence it appears extraordinary, that in the arrangement of St. Paul's Epiſtles in the New Teſtament, the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians ſhould have been placed before thoſe to the Theſſalonians.

It has been diſputed, and the diſpute is not yet determined, whether the name of this city ſhould be written Κολοσσαι, with an ο, or Κολασσαι with an α. Herodotus, Xenophon, Pliny and Strabo write it in the former manner: but St. Paul appears to have written it according to the latter orthography. For the Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus, and Codex Ephrem, the three moſt important Greek manuſcripts, which contain this Epiſtle, have Κολασσαι: and to theſe may be added, eighteen other manuſcripts quoted by Welſtein, ten quoted by Matthäi, and the ſecond Göttingen manuſcript. Origen, who is great authority, and ſeveral other fathers quoted by Wetſtein and Grieſbach write it in the ſame manner: and this orthography is likewiſe obſerved in the Coptic and both the Syriac verſions. But if St. Paul really wrote Κολασσαι, we muſt ſuppoſe that it was thus written by the inhabitants themſelves: for though he had never been there himſelf, when he wrote the Epiſtle, yet Oneſimus and Epaphras were with him at that time, who were both of them from this place [e], and therefore muſt have known its real name [f]. For this reaſon I wrote, in the preceding editions of this Introduction, 'Epiſtle to the Colaſſians:' but as this mode of writing met with diſapprobation, as being different from the common cuſtom, and it is of very little importance, in what

[e] The Epiſtle was alſo ſent by the hands of Oneſimus.

[f] The queſtion might be determined with greater certainty, if ancient inſcriptions could be diſcovered in the place where this city ſtood. The place might be eaſily found, for it is clearly determined by being at the conflux of the Lycus and the Meander.

what manner the name be written, I write at preſent 'Epiſtle to the Coloſſians.'

The Chriſtian community in Coloſſæ, Laodicea, and Hierapolis, cities which lay in the neighbourhood of each other, but which have been long ſince deſtroyed, were cloſely connected, as may be naturally ſuppoſed from their ſituation, and as appears from Col. iv. 13. where all three are mentioned together. From Col. ii. 1. we ſee that St. Paul, when he wrote this Epiſtle, had been neither at Coloſſæ, nor at Laodicea: and therefore he was concerned for their ſafety, on hearing that they were in danger of being ſeduced by falſe teachers. It is true that he had twice travelled through Phrygia[g]: but, as this was a very extenſive country, we muſt not infer, that he viſited every city in it. Coloſſæ eſpecially, as being only a ſmall town, he might very eaſily have left unnoticed; and if we have any reaſon to wonder, it is that he did not viſit Laodicea, becauſe this was the capital of Phrygia. But if we examine a good map of Phrygia, eſpecially that of D'Anville, we ſhall not think it extraordinary that St. Paul in neither of his two journies through Phrygia went even to Laodicea: for it appears from the two paſſages juſt quoted from the Acts of the Apoſtles that his route lay each time through the north of Phrygia, whereas Laodicea, as well as Coloſſæ and Hierapolis, were ſituate in the ſouthern part of that country. The firſt time that he went through Phrygia, (Acts xvi. 6. 7.) he came from Derbe, which was about four degrees to the eaſt of Coloſſæ, and travelled through Phrygia and Galatia, the boundary of which countries is between the 39th and 40th degrees of latitude: thence he came into Myſia, which lay nearly in the ſame latitude, and intended to go into Bithynia, which lay to the north of Phrygia. The route therefore, which he took from Derbe, muſt have been through the northern part of Phrygia. On his ſecond journey (Acts xviii. 23.) he likewiſe travelled through Galatia, as well as Phrygia. We muſt conclude therefore, that his route lay then alſo through the northern parts: and this is confirmed by what

[g] Acts xvi. 6. xviii. 23.

what St. Luke ſays, ch. xix. 1, where he expreſsly relates that St. Paul travelled through the upper parts, (τα ανωτερικα μερη), that is, the northern diſtricts of Aſia Minor. But the latitude of Coloſſæ was about 38, and therefore one or two degrees to the ſouth of St. Paul's road: whence it appears, that St. Paul's having twice travelled through Phrygia by no means implies that he viſited Coloſſæ.

St. Paul himſelf ſays in his Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, ch. ii. 1. as plainly, I think, as words can imply, that when he wrote this Epiſtle, he had never been either at Coloſſæ, or at Laodicea. But Lardner, and before him Theodoret, have endeavoured to interpret this paſſage, ſo as to make it imply the contrary [h]. The words of St. Paul are, Θελω γαρ υμας ειδεναι ηλικον αγωνα εχω περι υμων, και των εν Λαοδικεια, και οσοι ουχ' εωρακασι το προσωπον μου εν σαρκι. It is obvious therefore, as it appears to me at leaſt, that the Coloſſians and the Laodiceans were reckoned by St. Paul among thoſe, who had never ſeen him in perſon. But Lardner conſiders the latter clauſe as an antitheſis, and as oppoſed to the Coloſſians and Laodiceans: whence he argues that theſe had really ſeen St. Paul in perſon. Now this interpretation does violence, not only to the grammatical conſtruction, but likewiſe

[h] In the Supplement to his Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, vol. II. ch. 14. Lardner has brought ſeveral arguments to prove, that St. Paul had been at Coloſſæ, long before he wrote this Epiſtle, and that he himſelf founded the church there. His arguments have not convinced me of the truth of this opinion: but whether it be right, or not, I leave to the deciſion of the reader. I muſt make however one obſervation on his ninth argument, which he deduces from Col. iii. 16. where St. Paul ſays: 'teaching and admoniſhing one another in pſalms, and hymns, and ſpiritual ſongs, ſinging with grace in your hearts to the Lord.' This ſhews, as Lardner ſays, that the Coloſſians were endowed with ſpiritual gifts: and that as ſpiritual gifts could be communicated only by Apoſtles, the Coloſſians muſt have received them from St. Paul. But this paſſage really ſhews no ſuch thing: it ſhews that the Coloſſians had the power, not of making, but only of ſinging, ſpiritual ſongs; and if this requires a ſupernatural endowment, every man who ſings the pſalms of David muſt have a ſupernatural endowment. Beſides, if the paſſage really implied what Lardner ſuppoſes, it would not prove that St. Paul had been at Coloſſæ: for ſome individuals of the Coloſſian community might have ſeen St. Paul in other places, and have there received from him ſpiritual gifts.

likewiſe to the whole tenor of the paſſage. St. Paul expreſſes his anxiety for the ſafety of thoſe Chriſtians, who had not been taught by him in perſon, and confirmed by him in faith. How then could he expreſs an anxiety for the Coloſſians and Laodiceans, if he himſelf had actually inſtructed them in Chriſtianity?

But though St. Paul had never been at Coloſſæ, when he wrote this Epiſtle, yet Chriſtianity had long been taught, and a community of Chriſtians eſtabliſhed there. Who it was, that introduced it, I cannot pretend to determine: but it is not improbable that Epaphras[j], mentioned, ch. i. 7. iv. 12, 13. was one of the earlieſt teachers[k]. Further, as it appears from Acts xix. 10. that during St. Paul's reſidence at Epheſus, many, both Jews and Greeks, came from various parts of Aſia to hear the Goſpel, we may ſuppoſe that ſeveral Coloſſians, eſpecially Philemon, were of this number.

SECT. II.

Contents, deſign, and occaſion; of the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians.

THIS Epiſtle is chiefly directed againſt falſe moral doctrines, which appear to be Eſſene, and of which I have already treated, Ch. xiv. Sect. 2, 3. The opinion

[j] Epaphras muſt not be confounded with Epaphroditus, who was deputy from the Chriſtian community at Philippi.

[k] In the preceding editions of this Introduction, I deſcribed Epaphras as the founder of the church at Coloſſæ; but though he was one of the earlieſt, and one of the principal teachers of Chriſtianity in that city, it does not neceſſarily follow, that he was the perſon who firſt introduced it. As St. Paul jubjoins the name of Timothy to his own, ch. i. 1. it is not improbable, that Timothy had taught Chriſtianity at Coloſſæ. Throughout the whole of the firſt chapter St. Paul ſpeaks in their joint names, and uſes the plural number 'we,' except where the ſubject relates to his own impriſonment, and where Timothy therefore could not be included. From ch. ii. 1. he proceeds in the firſt perſon ſingular. Here again therefore he diſtinguiſhes what concerned only himſelf, from that, in which Timothy was likewiſe concerned.

nion of other commentators, that it was written againſt the Gnoſtics, may likewiſe, in ſome reſpects, be true. If we take the word 'Gnoſtic' in the ſenſe in which it is uſed by many of the fathers, to denote one who rejected the law of Moſes, who permitted the eating of meat offered to idols, and fornication, and taught the doctrine, that the world was created by a being of inferior order, it is certain that the perſons, whom St. Paul oppoſes in his Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, were the very reverſe of Gnoſtics. But if the word 'Gnoſtic' be taken to denote in general terms an adherent to the Oriental philoſophy, the Eſſenes themſelves may in this ſenſe be called Gnoſtics. In ch. ii. 8. St. Paul calls the doctrine of thoſe, who attempted to ſeduce the Coloſſians, by the name of φιλοσοφια. Now the doctrine, by which the Coloſſians were in danger of being perverted, the neceſſity of circumciſion, related to the obſervance of the ſabbath, abſtinence from unclean meats, and the worſhipping of angels. But this was the doctrine of the Eſſenes: and their doctrine is called by Joſephus likewiſe by the name of Philoſophy: for in his hiſtory of the Jewiſh war, B. II. ch. 2. § 8—13. he ſays, Τρια παρα Ιουδαιοις εἰδη φιλοσοφειται——τριτον Εσσηνοι καλουνται.

The contents of the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians have a remarkable affinity to thoſe of the Epiſtle to the Epheſians; except that the errors, which St. Paul confutes in the latter, are more manifeſtly Eſſene, than thoſe, which he combats in the former. Whoever would underſtand theſe Epiſtles muſt read them together; for the one is in moſt places a commentary on the other, the meaning of ſingle paſſages in one Epiſtle, which alone might be variouſly interpreted, being determined by the parallel paſſages in the other Epiſtle. If that Epiſtle, for which St. Paul commands the Coloſſians, ch. iv. 16. to ſend, from Laodicea, was no other than his Epiſtle to the Epheſians, as I really believe, the advice which he gave was obviouſly founded on the neceſſity of the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, for the underſtanding of that, which he wrote to the Coloſſians.

The

The queſtion here occurs: Why did St. Paul, who, conſidering his very extenſive connexions, was not prodigal of his Epiſtles, write to the Coloſſians, not only at the ſame time that he wrote to the Epheſians, but even on the ſame ſubject, eſpecially if the Epiſtle to the Epheſians was a circular Epiſtle, intended to be ſent to ſeveral cities, and among the reſt to Laodicea, from which place the Coloſſians were ordered to procure a copy of it? Or, if he thought it neceſſary to write a particular Epiſtle to a city of Phrygia, why did he not direct it rather to Laodicea the capital, than to Coloſſæ a town of leſs note: and command the church of Laodicea to ſalute that at Coloſſæ, rather than the contrary, as he had done, Col. iv. 15.? Would not a copy of the circular Epiſtle have been ſufficient for the Coloſſians, rather than for the Laodiceans? To this we may anſwer, that ſeveral circumſtances concurred, which induced St. Paul to write this Epiſtle.

1. Oneſimus, whom St. Paul had converted to Chriſtianity, and who carried the Epiſtle to Coloſſæ, was himſelf a Coloſſian. Further, Epaphras, a principal teacher of the Coloſſians, was likewiſe with St. Paul when he wrote this Epiſtle, ch. i. 7, 8. iv. 12, 13.

2. By the means of theſe two perſons, eſpecially the latter, he had probably received circumſtantial accounts of the ſituation of the church at Coloſſæ, and of the erroneous opinions which prevailed there. It is even poſſible that the Epiſtle was written at the particular requeſt of Epaphras, who was greatly intereſted in the welfare of the Coloſſian church, as well as in that of the churches in Laodicea and Hierapolis, ch. iv. 13.

3. St. Paul himſelf was much concerned for the Coloſſians, and for all the neighbouring communities, where he had not preached the Goſpel in perſon, ch. ii. 1.

4. The Apoſtle appears to have had likewiſe in view the confirmation of that doctrine, which the Coloſſians had received from Epaphras, ch. i. 7, 8.

5. Though there is a great ſimilarity between the Epiſtles to the Epheſians and Coloſſians, yet the latter

contains many things, which are not in the former, eſpecially in regard to the worſhip of angels, and many other ſingle points, which appear to be Eſſene, and which perhaps prevailed at Coloſſæ, and in its neighbourhood, more than in other places.

On the other hand, the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians contains upon the whole much leſs matter than the Epiſtle to the Epheſians. But if the latter was a circular Epiſtle, of which the Coloſſians were to procure a copy from Laodicea, there was no neceſſity for St. Paul to repeat, in the particular Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, what he had ſaid in the circular Epiſtle, except what eſpecially related to the neceſſities of the church of Coloſſæ. Another difference between the two Epiſtles conſiſts in this, that in the Epiſtle to the Epheſians St. Paul not only recommends unanimity among the members of the Chriſtian community at Epheſus, whether Jews or Gentiles, but likewiſe diſtinguiſhes them from each other, where he repreſents them as being equal in the kingdom of God, by 'ye' and 'we.' This I have not obſerved in the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians. Perhaps therefore the Coloſſian community conſiſted wholly of Gentile converts, which is not impoſſible, even though Jewiſh Eſſene doctrines had been introduced there: or, if it conſiſted of Jewiſh as well as of Gentile converts, perhaps leſs diſtinction was made at Coloſſæ between the two parties, than in other cities of Aſia Minor.

It is remarkable that in the two Epiſtles to the Epheſians and Coloſſians, and in theſe only, St. Paul warns his readers againſt lying. Epheſ. iv. 25. Col. iii. 9. Hence we may conclude, that this vice prevailed more at Epheſus and Coloſſæ, than in other places to which St. Paul ſent Epiſtles: and as both of theſe cities lay in Aſia Minor, it is not improbable, that it was the vice of the country, for this vice is often national, as the love of truth is often a national virtue. Were I an Apoſtle, and had to ſend an apoſtolical Epiſtle to England, I ſhould think it wholly unneceſſary to give any

any directions againſt lying, becauſe this vice is held in great abhorrence in England[1]: but there are countries in Europe, to which, if a paſtoral Epiſtle were addreſſed, the mention of this vice would not be ſuperfluous.

SECT. III.

Of the Epiſtle, for which St. Paul deſires the Coloſſians, Ch. iv. 16. *to ſend from Laodicea.*

ST. PAUL deſires the Coloſſians, ch. iv. 16. to ſend to Laodicea the Epiſtle, which they themſelves had received, and to ſend for another from Laodicea, which was to be read alſo at Coloſſæ. The words of St. Paul are: Και ὁταν αναγνωσθη παρ' ὑμιν ἡ επιστολη, ποιησατε ἱνα και εν τη Λαοδικεων εκκλησια αναγνωσθη, και την εκ Λαοδικειας ἱνα και ὑμεις αναγνωτε. Now the former part of this verſe is clear: but it is not ſo clear, what Epiſtle St. Paul meant by ἡ επιστολη εκ Λαοδικειας. Theſe words have been interpreted three different ways.

1. Ἡ επιστολη εκ Λαοδικειας has been explained, as denoting 'an Epiſtle, which had been written from Laodicea to St. Paul.' This Epiſtle has been ſuppoſed to have contained ſeveral queſtions, propoſed to the Apoſtle by the Laodiceans, which he anſwered in the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians; and hence it has been inferred that St. Paul ordered them to read the former, as being neceſſary toward a right underſtanding of the latter. To this opinion I ſubſcribed in the three firſt editions of this Introduction: but I am now perſuaded that it is falſe. For if St. Paul had received an Epiſtle from Laodicea, the capital of Phrygia, he would have returned the anſwer to the queſtions, which it contained, to Laodicea itſelf,

[1] I except however news-paper and pamphlet writers, coffee-houſe politicians, and ſtock-jobbers.

itſelf, and not to a ſmall town in the neighbourhood. Beſides, there would have been a manifeſt impropriety in ſending to the Coloſſians anſwers to queſtions, with which they were not acquainted, and then, after they had the Epiſtle, which contained the anſwers, deſiring them to read that, which contained the queſtions.

2. Another opinion is, that St. Paul meant an Epiſtle which he himſelf had written at Laodicea, and ſent from that place to Timothy, becauſe the Greek ſubſcription to the firſt Epiſtle to Timothy is, Προς Τιμοθεον εγραφη απο Λαοδικειας. This opinion is defended by Theophylact: but it is undoubtedly falſe. For it is evident from Col. ii. 1. that St. Paul had never been at Laodicea, when he wrote his Epiſtle to the Coloſſians: and if he had, he would not have diſtinguiſhed an Epiſtle, which he had written there, by the place where it was written, but by the perſon or community, to which it was ſent. It was not St. Paul's cuſtom to date his Epiſtles: for the ſubſcriptions, which we now find annexed to them, were all added at a later period, and by unknown perſons. If therefore he had meant an Epiſtle, which he himſelf had written at Laodicea, he certainly would not have denoted it by the title of ἡ επιστολη εκ Λαοδικειας.

3. There remains therefore no other poſſible interpretation of theſe words than an 'Epiſtle, which the Laodiceans had received from St. Paul,' and which the Coloſſians were ordered to procure from Laodicea, when they communicated to the Laodiceans their own Epiſtle.

But, as among the Epiſtles of St. Paul in our own canon, not one is addreſſed to the Laodiceans in particular, the queſtion again occurs: Which, and where is this Epiſtle?

1. There exiſts an Epiſtle, which goes by the name of St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Laodiceans. But this is undoubtedly a forgery, though a very ancient one: for Theodoret, who lived in the fifth century, ſpeaks of it in his Note to the paſſage in queſtion, and ſays,

αυτικα

αυτικα τοινυν και προφερεσι πεπλασμενην επιστολην. That the reader may judge of its authenticity, I will inſert the whole of it, as printed in Fabricii Codex Apocryphus Nov. Teſt. Tom. I. p. 873—879. Παυλος αποστολος, ουκ απ' ανθρωπων, ουδε δι' ανθρωπου, αλλα δια Ιησου Χριστου, τοις εν Λαοδικειᾳ αδελφοις· χαρις υμιν και ειρηνη απο Θεου πατρος, και Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου. Ευχαριστω τω Θεω μου τω Χριστω παντοτε εν ταις προσευχαις μου, ὁτι εμμενοντες και προσκαρτερουντες υμεις εστε επ' εργων καλων, προσδεχομενοι την επαγγελιαν εν ημερᾳ κρισεως. Και μη ταραξωσιν υμας ματαιολογιαι τινων, των υποκρινομενων την αληθειαν, του διαστρεψαι υμας απο της αληθειας του ευαγγελιου του ευαγγελισθεντος απ' εμου. Νυν δε ποιησει ὁ Θεος, ἱνα παντες οι εξ εμου εισιν, εις την τελειοτητα της αληθειας του ευαγγελιου φερωνται, του ποιησαι την χρηστοτητα των εργων, ἁ πρεπει τῃ σωτηριᾳ της ζωης αιωνιου. Και νυν φανεροι εγενοντο οι δεσμοι μου, εν οις δεσμοις ειμι εν Χριστω, και εν τουτω χαιρω· αλλα και χαρησομαι, οιδα γαρ, ὁτι τουτο μοι αποβησεται εις σωτηριαν αιωνιον, ὁ εγειετο δια της υμων δεησεως και επιχορηγιας του πνευματος ἁγιου, ειτε δια ζωης, ειτε δια θανατου, εμοι γαρ το ζην Χριστος, και το αποθανειν χαρα. Αυτος δε ὁ Κυριος ημων εν υμιν ποιησει το ελεος αυτου μεθ' υμων, ἱνα την αυτην αγαπην εχοντες συμψυχοι το αυτο φρονητε. Δια τουτο, ἀγαπητοι, καθως ηκουσατε την παρουσιαν του Κυριου, ὁτως φρονειτε και ποιειτε εν φοβῳ του Θεου, και εσται υμιν ζωη αιωνιος, ὁ γαρ Θεος εστιν ὁ ενεργων εν υμιν. Παντα ποιειτε χωρις γογγυσμων και διαλογισμων. Και το λοιπον, ἀγαπητοι, χαιρετε εν τῳ Κυριῳ Ιησου Χριστῳ, και ὁρατε, και φυλασσεσθε απο πασης αισχρου κερδους πλεονεξιας. Παντα τα αἰτηματα υμων παρρησιᾳ γνωριζεσθω προς τον Θεον, και βεβαιοι γινεσθε εν νοι του Χριστου. Και τα λοιπον, αδελφοι, ὁσα εστιν αληθη, ὁσα σεμνα, ὁσα ἁγνα, ὁσα δικαια, ὁσα προσφιλη, ταυτα πρασσετε. Και ἁ ηκουσατε και παρελαβετε, εν καρδιαις υμων κατεχετε, και εσται υμιν ειρηνη. Ασπασασθε τους αδελφους παντας εν φιληματι ἁγιῳ. Ασπαζονται υμας οι ἁγιοι παντες. Η χαρις του Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου μετα του πνευματος υμων. Ἀμην. Ποιησατε ἱνα ἡ επιστολη και εν τῃ Κολοσσων εκκλησιᾳ αναγνωσθῃ, και την εκ Κολοσσων ἱνα και υμεις αναγνωτε. This Epiſtle is likewiſe contained in the old German Bibles printed about the year 1462; for inſtance, in that

that which I have deſcribed in the Syntagma Commentationum, Tom. I. Num. 1. and in which this Epiſtle is placed between the Epiſtles to the Galatians and Epheſians. But it is manifeſtly a mere rhapſody, collected from St. Paul's other Epiſtles, and which no critic can receive as a genuine work of the Apoſtle. It contains nothing, which it was neceſſary for the Coloſſians to know, nothing that is not ten times better and more fully explained in the Epiſtle, which St. Paul ſent to the Coloſſians; in ſhort nothing, which could be ſuitable to St. Paul's deſign.

2. As the Epiſtle therefore, which now goes by the name of St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Laodiceans, is a forgery, the Apoſtle might mean an Epiſtle, which he had ſent to the Laodiceans, and which is now loſt. An objection however to this opinion, (namely, that he had ſent an Epiſtle to the Laodiceans in particular) may be made from Col. iv. 15. where St. Paul requeſts the Coloſſians to ſalute Nymphas, who was a Laodicean. If he had written a particular Epiſtle to the Laodiceans, he would have ſaluted Nymphas rather in this Epiſtle, than in that to the Coloſſians.

3. There remains a third explanation, which is not clogged with the preceding difficulty, namely that St. Paul meant an Epiſtle, which he had written partly, but not ſolely for the uſe of the Laodiceans. This Epiſtle may be that, which is called the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, and of which I ſhall treat in the following chapter.

CHAP. XX.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

SECT. I.

Examination of the queſtion, whether the Epiſtle, which is called the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, was really addreſſed to the Epheſians.

NOT only the ſuperſcription to this Epiſtle is ἡ προς Εφεσιους επιστολη, which indeed is of no great authority, but St. Paul's own words, ch. i. 1. are τοις ἁγιοις τοις ουσιν εν Εφεσῳ. If therefore this reading be genuine, the queſtion is at once decided. But there are ſeveral eminent critics, eſpecially Mill, J. Peirce, Whiſton, S. Crell, Wall, Benſon, the younger Vitringa, Venema, and Wetſtein, who prefer the reading τοις ουσιν εν Λαοδικειᾳ. Wetſtein has placed it under his text as preferable to the common reading: and Bowyer, in his edition of the Greek Teſtament, has taken it into the text itſelf. That men of ſuch learning as theſe, whom I have juſt quoted, eſpecially Wetſtein, who was not inclined to make alterations in the text of the Greek Teſtament, not even where it ſuited his own theological opinions, did not adopt this reading without ſtrong grounds, may be eaſily ſuppoſed, without my aſſerting it. But the queſtion is, are theſe grounds ſufficiently ſtrong, to prove that the reading εν Εφεσῳ is ſpurious? This queſtion has been very fully examined by Lardner[m], to whom I ſhall frequently have recourſe, though I differ from him in ſeveral material points.

That

[m] Supplement to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, vol. II. ch. 13.

That the reading εν Εφεσῳ is ſpurious, is hardly credible. On the contrary, I have no doubt that it is genuine: but I will not therefore aſſert, that it is the only genuine reading, any more than I would aſſert that, becauſe I believe the religion, in which I have been educated, leads to ſalvation, it is therefore the only one, which does ſo. That εν Εφεσῳ is genuine, we muſt conclude from this circumſtance, that it is confirmed by the authority of all the Greek manuſcripts hitherto collated, of all the ancient verſions, and of the Greek Fathers, who, as Lardner has ſhewn, are unanimous in their opinion, that the Epiſtle was written to the Epheſians, and have quoted in no inſtance εν Λαοδικειᾳ in this paſſage, inſtead of εν Εφεσῳ. Nor is any other reading quoted by the Manichæans, though they were in general diſpoſed to make alterations in the New Teſtament.

The authority of the Greek Fathers is in the preſent inſtance of much greater importance, than in moſt other critical queſtions: it is in fact deciſive. The teſtimony of Ignatius alone is ſufficient: for he not only lived at the ſame time with St. Paul, but was particularly connected with the Epheſians, and wrote to them an Epiſtle: and moreover, when he wrote to them his Epiſtle, ſeveral members of the Epheſian church were with him, namely Burrhus, who was deacon at Epheſus, Crocus, Euphus, and Fronto[a]. Under theſe circumſtances, it is abſolutely impoſſible, that Ignatius ſhould not have known, whether the Epiſtle, which is called St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Epheſians, was addreſſed to the Epheſians, or not. But it is a certain fact, that Ignatius conſidered this Epiſtle as one addreſſed to the Epheſians. In the twelfth chapter of the Epiſtle, which he himſelf wrote to the Epheſians, he calls them Παυλε συμμυσαι τε ἡγιασμενε, and adds ὃς εν πασῃ επιστολῃ, μνημονευει ὑμων εν Χριστῳ Ιησε. The expreſſion εν πασῃ επιστολῃ cannot be tranſlated 'in every Epiſtle,' for in every

[a] Lardner, p. 408.

every Epiſtle St. Paul did not ſpeak of the Epheſians; conſequently it muſt be tranſlated 'in the whole Epiſtle,' and Ignatius muſt mean a ſingle or particular Epiſtle, which the Epheſians had received from St. Paul. The words μνημονευει ὑμων εν Χριστῳ Ιησυ, which in themſelves are ſomewhat obſcure, receive great light from that very Epiſtle, which we call the Epiſtle to the Epheſians. Throughout the whole of the Epiſtle St. Paul praiſes the community to which he is writing, without any intermixture of cenſure, and ſpeaks of the great advantages, which they as Chriſtians enjoy in Chriſt Jeſus: which words 'in Chriſt Jeſus,' 'through Chriſt' 'in the beloved,' &c. occur inceſſantly in this Epiſtle, and in a manner not uſual in St. Paul's other Epiſtles, ſo that they are in ſome meaſure the diſtinguiſhing marks of this Epiſtle*. The examples are ſo numerous, that it is unneceſſary to quote them, which I rather omit for this reaſon, that the whole Epiſtle ſhould be read, in order that their full effect may be perceived. The advocates for the opinion that this Epiſtle was addreſſed to the Laodiceans, and not to the Epheſians, have no other method of avoiding the force of this argument, (unleſs they declare at once that the Epiſtle of Ignatius is a forgery) than an alteration in the words of Ignatius, as well as in thoſe of St. Paul, and the changing, for the ſake of their hypotheſis. μνημονευει, which applies to St. Paul, to μνημονευω in the firſt perſon, in order to make it apply to Ignatius. But this alteration was not admitted by Wetſtein, who candidly confeſſes: 'Ignatius in Epiſtola ad Epheſios non obſcure ſignificat hanc Epiſtolam a Paulo ad Epheſios fuiſſe ſcriptam; § 12. reſpicit ad i. 16. et § 1. ad v. 2.

The other expreſſion of Ignatius, Παυλε συμμυσται, implies that St. Paul had deſcribed the Epheſians as his

* This obſervation, which is of great conſequence in explaining the words of Ignatius, eſcaped the notice both of Pearſon in his Vindiciæ Epiſtolarum Ignatii, P. II. c. 10. and of Lardner, p. 400, 401.

his Symmyſtæ, or as perſons initiated in the ſame myſteries with himſelf. Now in the Epiſtle, which we call the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, there is really a paſſage, on which this expreſſion of Ignatius appears to be grounded. For in ch. iii. 3, 4. he uſes the word μυστηριον, and then ver. 6. calls the perſons, to whom he is writing, συγκληρονομοι, και συσσωμοι, και συμμετοχοι. It is true that neither the word συμμυστης itſelf, nor even μυστης occurs in this Epiſtle: yet Palladius declares that St. Paul did call the Epheſians μυσται. The paſſage is quoted by Lardner from Palladius[p], as follows. 'Paul called the Cretans liars, Tit. i. 12. the Galatians ſtupid, Gal. iii. 1. and the Corinthians proud, 1 Cor. v. 2. On the other hand, he calls the Romans faithful, the Epheſians μυσται, initiated, to whom alſo he writes in a ſublime manner, and the Theſſalonians lovers of the brotherhood.' It is therefore not impoſſible, that St. Paul actually uſed the word συμμυσται in this Epiſtle, and perhaps where we find at preſent συμμετοχοι: but I mention this as a mere conjecture, on which I ſhall not inſiſt. For Palladius might mean only, according to the ſenſe, and not according to the terms, eſpecially as he ſays in this very paſſage, that St. Paul called the Romans 'faithful,' and the Theſſalonians 'lovers of the brotherhood,' though the term πιστοι itſelf does not once occur in the Epiſtle to the Romans, nor φιλαδελφοι in either of the Epiſtles to the Theſſalonians.

Thus far in favour of the opinion, that the Epiſtle, called the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, was really addreſſed to the Epheſians. On the other hand, it cannot be denied, that it contains many paſſages, which we ſhould hardly expect to find in an Epiſtle addreſſed to a community, where St. Paul himſelf had ſpent three years, and where Timothy at his command had appointed biſhops. In the third edition of this Introduction

[p] In the works of Chryſoſtom, Vol. XIII. p. 71. E.

duction I endeavoured to give ſeveral anſwers to this objection: but after a more mature conſideration, I am perſuaded that they are not ſatisfactory. The objection clearly proves, that the Epiſtle was not addreſſed to the Epheſians alone: but it does not affect the opinion, that it was intended jointly for the Epheſians, Laodiceans, and ſeveral other Chriſtian communities. The objection may be divided into the following articles:

1. St. Paul mentions in this Epiſtle no circumſtance whatſoever peculiar to the city and Chriſtian community of Epheſus, though in his other Epiſtles he very frequently alludes to the particular ſituation of the perſon or perſons, to whom he is writing, as indeed every one muſt, who writes a letter. Yet St. Paul was thoroughly acquainted with the peculiar ſituation of the Chriſtian community at Epheſus: for he had paſſed not leſs than three years there[q]. Nor is there any alluſion in this Epiſtle to what St. Paul himſelf had ſuffered at Epheſus, or even to his having reſided there. Further, if we compare the contents of this Epiſtle with St. Paul's farewell ſpeech to the Epheſian elders[r], we ſhall hardly ſuppoſe that it was addreſſed to thoſe very perſons, from whom he had thus affectionately taken leave only ſix years before.

2. In moſt of his other Epiſtles, he ſalutes the principal perſons of the community, to which he writes: but in the Epiſtle in queſtion, though, from his long reſidence at Epheſus, he muſt have had more intimate friends there, than in any other place, he ſalutes no perſon whatſoever. Lardner indeed contends, that this argument is of no force, becauſe St. Paul, in his Epiſtle to the Romans ſalutes more perſons, than in any other of his Epiſtles, though he himſelf had never been at Rome. But this anſwer amounts to nothing. For though St. Paul might have many friends in a place where he had never been, yet we muſt not argue in an inverted order, and conclude, that in a place, where St.

[q] Acts xx. 31. [r] Acts xx. 18—36.

St. Paul had ſpent three years, he had no friend whatſoever, whom he thought worthy of a ſalutation.

3. When St. Paul ſent this Epiſtle, Timothy was with him: for the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, which was ſent at the ſame time[s], was written in the joint names of St. Paul and Timothy[t]. But Timothy was moſt intimately connected with the Chriſtian community at Epheſus, and had both ſelected and appointed their elders and miniſters. Yet St. Paul has neither annexed the name of Timothy to his own, though he did ſo in the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, which was written at the ſame time, nor even ſent a ſalutation from him.

4. St. Paul ſays, ch. i. 15, 16. 'Wherefore I alſo, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jeſus, and love unto all the ſaints, ceaſe not to give thanks for you.' The expreſſion, 'after I *heard* of your faith,' is not very conſiſtent with the ſuppoſition that St. Paul was writing to the members of a church, which he himſelf had founded. If, in order to invalidate this argument, the words of St. Paul, ακουσας την καθ' υμας πιστιν be rendered otherwiſe, and be made to ſignify 'when, or as often as, I hear mention made of your faith,' ſtill it will be difficult to find an anſwer to the following argument.

5. St. Paul ſays, ch. iii. 1, 2. 'For this cauſe, I Paul, the priſoner of Jeſus Chriſt for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the diſpenſation of the grace of God, which is given me to you-ward.' In this manner he would ſurely not have written to perſons, whom he himſelf had inſtructed in the doctrines of Chriſtianity, and among whom he had reſided three years: for of ſuch perſons he could not poſſibly have expreſſed a doubt whether they had heard of the diſpenſation given

[s] Tychicus was the bearer of both, as appears from Epheſ. vi. 21, 22. Col. iv. 7, 8.: to ſay nothing of their great ſimilarity in expreſſions, as well as in thoughts.

[t] Col. i. 1.

given him, that is, of his divine apoſtleſhip, or not. And if we ſuppoſe, that in the interval, which elapſed between St. Paul's departure from Epheſus, and the time of his writing this Epiſtle, the Epheſian church had been augmented by the acceſſion of ſeveral thouſand members, it is improbable, that even among theſe new members there was any one, who had not been informed that St. Paul was an Apoſtle. This argument therefore appears to me to be deciſive.

SECT. II.

Whether this Epiſtle was an Epiſtle to the Laodiceans.

THE advocates for the opinion that the genuine reading in Epheſ. i. 1. is not τοις ουσιν εν Εφεσῳ, but τοις ουσιν εν Λαοδικειᾳ, have no other authority than that of Marcion. It is true that Marcion was an heretic, and one who made very many alterations in the New Teſtament, in order to render it more ſuitable to his own ſyſtem: but, as I have already obſerved[u], not all the deviations in Marcion's copy of the Greek Teſtament are to be conſidered as corruptions, and in the preſent inſtance it is difficult to conceive what benefit could accrue to Marcion's theological opinions from an alteration of εν Εφεσῳ to εν Λαοδικειᾳ. The very early age therefore in which Marcion lived, the place of his birth, his travels, and his learning, render him in the preſent caſe, which has no concern with either orthodoxy or heterodoxy, a very important witneſs. He lived in the former part of the ſecond century, was a native of Sinope, a city celebrated for its

[u] Vol. I. Ch. VI. Sect. 12.

its valuable libraries[w], took a journey in the earlier part of his life to Rome, and on this journey travelled perhaps through Laodicea or Epheſus. But even if he never viſited either of theſe places, and ſaw only in his native country, Pontus, copies of the Epiſtle in queſtion with εν Λαοδικειᾳ, this reading acquires a very ſtrong ſupport. It is to be lamented that we have not Marcion's own words, from which we might have learnt on what authorities, or on what manuſcripts, he grounded this reading. Our knowledge on this ſubject is derived merely from the two following paſſages in Tertullian's fifth book againſt Marcion. The one is c. xi. Prætereo hic et de alia epiſtola, quam nos ad Epheſios perſcriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodicenos[x]: the other is c. xvii. Eccleſiæ quidem veritate Epiſtolam iſtam ad Epheſios habemus emiſſam, non ad Laodicenos. Sed Marcion et titulum aliquando interpolare geſtiit, quaſi et in illo diligentiſſimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulo intereſt, cum ad omnes Apoſtolus ſcripſerit, dum ad ſingulos[y]. In theſe two paſſages Tertullian, as uſual, appears merely as an advocate againſt heretics, and not as a cool critic, or impartial inquirer into truth; for he accuſes him at once of interpolation and corruption, without examining the ground of his opinion, which is ſo far from meriting reprobation without inquiry, that it has been adopted in later ages by ſeveral writers of the moſt eminent abilities. And this neglect of Tertullian is attended with great inconvenience in the preſent inquiry, becauſe

[w] Moſes Chorenenſis relates in his Hiſtory of Armenia, p. 101, that Africanus a writer of the third century, derived the greateſt part of his materials relative to what concerned Armenia from manuſcripts in the library of Edeſſa, whither the treaſures had been brought, which were contained in the libraries and archives at Niſibis and Sinope.

[x] Tertullian is here ſpeaking of Epheſ. iii. 1, 2.

[y] Here he is ſpeaking of ſeveral paſſages: ch. i. 10. 12. ii. 1, 2, 3. 10, 11. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. 19, 20. iv. 11, 12.

cauſe Epiphanius, in his forty-ſecond Hereſy[z], ſpeaks of Marcion, as if he had an Epiſtle to the Laodiceans different from that to the Epheſians. My ſentiments on what Epiphanius ſays on this ſubject I ſhall deliver in the following ſection, where I ſhall endeavour to ſhew that Marcion's opinion agreed with the hypotheſis, which I ſhall there attempt to ſupport. In the mean time if the reader chuſes to examine what other writers have ſaid, he may conſult Hody[a] and Lardner[b]. I muſt obſerve however at preſent, that the contradiction is only apparent; and that if Marcion's authority does not give ſufficient ſupport to the reading εν Λαοδικειᾳ, Epheſ. i. 1. it muſt be aſcribed merely to the imperfection of our accounts.

If it was the real opinion of Marcion, that the Epiſtle, which is called the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, was addreſſed to the Laodiceans, he deduced it from the circumſtances and contents of the Epiſtle itſelf. That St. Paul muſt have written to the Laodiceans about the ſame time that he wrote to the Coloſſians, I have already obſerved in the third ſection of the preceding chapter. And the Epiſtle, which is now the ſubject of inquiry, has all the appearance of being that very Epiſtle, which St. Paul deſired the Coloſſians to procure from Laodicea: for it affords the beſt explanation of the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, the two Epiſtles in fact illuſtrating and completing each other.

On the other hand, if the Epiſtle, which is called the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, was in fact an Epiſtle to the Laodiceans, it may be objected, that St. Paul would hardly have deſired the Coloſſians to greet in his name the Laodiceans[c], to whom he wrote, according to this hypotheſis,

[z] Pag. 309, 310. 318, 319.

[a] De textibus originalibus, p. 664.

[b] Supplement, Vol. II. p. 462—468.

[c] Col. iv. 15. Nymphas alſo appears to have been a member of the Laodicean community. Why then did St. Paul ſalute Nymphas in the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, rather than in the Epiſtle to the Laodiceans?

hypotheſis, at the ſame time. Mill indeed ſuppoſes, that St. Paul's deſign in greeting the Laodiceans in his Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, was to make amends for having concluded the Epiſtle to the Laodiceans, not with the words 'Grace be with you,' but with 'Grace be with all them, that love our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in ſincerity[d].' But, as this was equivalent to 'Grace be with you,' at leaſt in reſpect to all worthy members of the community, and might in fact be conſidered as a mark of eſteem, and as implying, that the perſons, to whom St. Paul was writing, really did love Chriſt in ſincerity, there was nothing in this concluſion, which required any reparation. Beſides, the contents of the whole Epiſtle are ſuch, that the perſons, who received it, could entertain no doubt of their being reſpected and loved by St. Paul. And at the beginning of it, as was uſual in the Greek Epiſtles, St. Paul had already given a formal ſalutation.

The arguments, which Wetſtein has produced to prove, that the Epiſtle in queſtion was written, not to the Epheſians, but to the Laodiceans, are very unſatisfactory. One of them is really a petitio principii. He ſays, 'Si Epheſiis ſcripta eſt, cur a Laodicenſibus erat petenda:' but this is taking for granted the thing to be proved, namely, that the Epiſtle, of which St. Paul ſpeaks, Col. iv. 16. was that, which we call the Epiſtle to the Epheſians. Another argument uſed by Wetſtein is grounded on the ſuppoſed ſimilarity of this Epiſtle, and of that to the Coloſſians, to the Epiſtle addreſſed to the angel of the church of Laodicea in the Apocalypſe. Now if this ſimilarity were real, which it certainly is not[e], ſtill Wetſtein's inference would be without

[d] Epheſ. vi. 24.

[e] I will quote two of Wetſtein's examples, and leave the reader to judge of the ſimilarity. Apoc. iii. 18. 'Anoint thine eyes with eye-ſalve, that thou mayeſt ſee,' he compares with Epheſ. i. 18. 'the eyes of your underſtanding being enlightened.' But the former paſſage contains a ſevere reproof, which cannot be ſaid of the latter.

In

out foundation: for the ſimilarity would conſiſt, not in the ſituation and circumſtances of the churches, from which alone we could argue, but merely in the thoughts and expreſſions. But we cannot ſuppoſe of an Epiſtle written by St. Paul to the Laodiceans, and of the Epiſtle to the Laodiceans in the Apocalypſe, that the one was an imitation of the other. And if we attend to the contents of theſe Epiſtles, we ſhall find reaſon to draw an inference directly oppoſite to that, which was drawn by Wetſtein. For no two Epiſtles can in this reſpect be more diſſimilar: the one being replete with praiſe, the other with cenſure. Since therefore the Epiſtle, which is called the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, was addreſſed to perſons, who enjoyed the eſteem of St. Paul, and the Epiſtle to the Laodiceans in the Apocalypſe was addreſſed to perſons, who were objects of ſevere reproof, we may rather conclude that they were not written to the ſame church: unleſs the inference be evaded by the ſuppoſition that the conduct of the Laodiceans at one time merited commendation, at another time reproach, a ſuppoſition, which is not warranted by either of the Epiſtles.

In another example he compares Apoc. iii. 20. 'Behold, I ſtand at the door, and knock,' with Col. iv. 3. 'that God would open to us a door of utterance, to ſpeak the myſtery of Chriſt.' Here there is no other ſimilarity than in the word door:' and an hundred other inſtances from various parts of the Bible might be produced with equal eaſe, by only having recourſe to a concordance.

SECT. III.

The Epiſtle, called the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, was probably confined to no Chriſtian community in particular: but was a circular Epiſtle intended for the uſe of the Epheſians, Laodiceans, and ſome other churches of Aſia Minor.

FROM the preceding doubts and contradictions we may be relieved by an hypotheſis, at preſent very generally received, but hitherto not ſupported by ſufficient arguments, that the Epiſtle in queſtion was addreſſed excluſively, neither to the Epheſians, nor to the Laodiceans; but that it was a circular Epiſtle intended for their joint uſe, and the uſe of ſome other churches in Aſia Minor, which Tychicus the bearer of this Epiſtle viſited on his journey, being commiſſioned by St. Paul to inquire into the ſituation of theſe ſeveral Chriſtian communities [f].

According to this hypotheſis then, St. Paul had ſeveral copies taken of this Epiſtle for the ſeveral communities, to which he intended it ſhould be ſent, and ſubſcribed with his own hand the words, ἡ χαρις μετα παντων των αγαπωντων τον Κυριον ἡμων Ιησουν Χριστον εν αφθαρσια, ch. vi. 24. at the end of each copy. At the beginning of the Epiſtle after the words τοις ἁγιοις τοις ουσιν, he added the name of the church to which the copy was to be ſent, ſo that in the copy intended for the Epheſians he wrote τοις ἁγιοις τοις ουσιν εν Εφεσῳ, in the copy intended for the Laodiceans, τοις ἁγιοις τοις ουσιν εν Λαοδικειᾳ, and in like manner in the other copies. Marcion therefore might have ſeen either in Pontus, or at Laodicea, a copy with the inſcription εν Λαοδικειᾳ. If this hypotheſis be adopted, all

[f] Col. iv. 8. Ὁν επεμψα προς ὑμας εις αυτο τουτο, ἱνα γνῳ τα περι ὑμων, και παρακαλεσῃ τας καρδιας ὑμων. Epheſ. vi. 22. Ὁν επεμψα προς ὑμας εις αυτο τουτο, ἱνα γνωτε τα περι ἡμων, και παρακαλεσῃ τας καρδιας ὑμων. In both theſe paſſages St. Paul certainly meant to ſay the ſame thing: and therefore in the latter, I would read γνῳ or γνῳ τε in two words, for γνωτε, and περι ὑμων for περι ἡμων.

all the arguments advanced in the firſt ſection of this chapter againſt the opinion, that the Epiſtle was written to the Epheſians, as well as thoſe in the ſecond ſection againſt the opinion, that it was written to the Laodiceans, fall at once to the ground. For a circular Epiſtle intended for the uſe of ſeveral churches muſt contain nothing peculiar to any one of them: it muſt contain no ſalutation to any individual either of this or of that community, becauſe the Epiſtle was general: nor could the name of Timothy have been annexed with propriety to that of St. Paul at the beginning of the Epiſtle, becauſe Timothy, though intimately connected with the Epheſian church, was not ſo with the other churches, for which the Epiſtle was deſigned. To the Coloſſians St. Paul did not ſend a copy of this Epiſtle, becauſe he wrote to them ſeparately: but he deſired them to ſend for it from Laodicea.

If it be aſked, from what cauſe the name of Epheſus (εν Εφεσῳ) became general in all the manuſcripts of the Greek Teſtament, and all the ancient verſions, to the excluſion of Laodicea, and other names, which the Apoſtle might have written in the reſpective copies, I anſwer, that when the ſeveral parts of the Greek Teſtament were collected into a volume, the copy inſerted in this collection muſt have been procured from Epheſus: of which the neceſſary conſequence was, that in the ſubſequent tranſcripts of the Greek Teſtament, which were made from this collection, the reading εν Εφεσῳ became the invariable reading, though εν Λαοδικειᾳ was ſtill to be found in ſeveral ſingle copies of this Epiſtle, which exiſted in the ſecond century.

It is probable that this hypotheſis agrees alſo with what Marcion thought on this ſubject. Tertullian, who was always more the advocate, than the critic, has not ſufficiently explained Marcion's ſentiments: but there is a paſſage in Epiphanius, which, though rather obſcure, will enable us to form at leaſt ſome judgement of this matter. In his 42d Hereſy, p. 309. of the Cologne edition printed in 1682, he ſays Marcion admitted

admitted only ten Epiſtles of St. Paul, in which he omitted ſome things and altered others[g]: and in the following page he enumerates theſe ten Epiſtles in the order in which they were placed by Marcion, namely, 1. the Epiſtle to the Galatians; 2. the firſt to the Corinthians; 3. the ſecond to the Corinthians; 4. the Ep. to the Romans; 5. the firſt to the Theſſalonians: 6. the ſecond to the Theſſalonians; 7. the Ep. to the Epheſians[h]; 8. to the Coloſſians; 9. to Philemon; 10. to the Philippians. Epiphanius then immediately adds, 'Marcion has alſo ſeveral fragments of an Epiſtle, which bears the name of an Epiſtle to the Laodiceans[i].' Here the queſtion occurs: had Marcion really two different Epiſtles, one called an Epiſtle to the Epheſians, the other to the Laodiceans: or were they one and the ſame Epiſtle, with different titles, which Epiphanius, miſtaking Marcion's meaning, repreſented as different Epiſtles? Now Epiphanius, p. 319. under the following title, Προς Φιλημονα Θ, παρ' ἡμιν δε ιγ' η και ιδ', προς Φιλιππησιους ί, παρ' ἡμιν δε ς, προς Λαοδικειςιά, quotes theſe words: Εἰς κυριος, μια πιςις, ἐν βαπτισμα, εἰς Θεος και πατηρ παντων, επι παντων και δια παντων, και εν πασιν. Theſe words are not in the ſpurious Epiſtle to the Laodiceans, but they are literally in our Epiſtle to the Epheſians. Yet Epiphanius quotes them under the article of the Επιςολη προς Λαοδικεις, which he calls ια, or the eleventh Epiſtle, according to the arrangement in Marcion's Apoſtolicon; and moreover p. 318. diſtinguiſhes from it the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, which he calls the ſeventh in Marcion's Apoſtolicon, and quotes the following paſſages, Epheſ. ii. 11. 12. v. 14. 31. as they were worded in his Apoſtolicon. This confuſion and contradiction I am unable to remove in any other manner than by ſuppoſing, that

[g] Εχει δε και επιςολας τω ἁγιω αποςολω δεκα, αἰς μοναις κεχρηται, ὁ πασι δε τοις εν αυταις γεγραμμενοις, αλλα τινα αυτων περιτεμνων, τινα δε αλλοιωσας κεφαλαια.

[h] Marcion therefore did not reject that Epiſtle, which is called the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, as one might conclude from the words of Tertullian above-quoted, unleſs we had this paſſage of Epiphanius.

[i] Εχει δε και της προς Λαοδικεις λεγομενης μερη.

that Marcion had not two different Epiſtles, the one to the Epheſians, the other to the Laodiceans, but only one, namely, that which is known at preſent by the former name: that in the age in which Marcion lived, ſome copies of this Epiſtle were inſcribed 'Epiſtle to the Epheſians,' and others 'Epiſtle to the Laodiceans:' that Marcion ſometimes quoted it under one title, ſometimes under the other, which led Epiphanius into error, and induced him to refer to two ſuppoſed different Epiſtles what Marcion had quoted from only one. Of this the example juſt quoted is a remarkable proof: ſince a paſſage which is really in our Epiſtle to the Epheſians, ch. iv. 5. 6. is produced by Epiphanius, as being in the Epiſtle called by Marcion the Epiſtle to the Laodiceans.

If the preceding ſtatement be admitted, the difficulties, in which this ſubject is involved, will be removed. If it be rejected, the accounts of Tertullian and Epiphanius will ceaſe to favour the opinion, that St. Paul ever wrote an Epiſtle, which was deſigned for the uſe of the Laodiceans: in which caſe we ſhall be deſtitute of all hiſtorical evidence in ſupport of this opinion. And, ſince it appears from the firſt ſection of this chapter, that the Epiſtle in queſtion could not well have been written for the excluſive uſe of the Epheſians, it follows that, unleſs it were written for the uſe of other communities, its authenticity will be doubtful.

SECT. IV.

Continuation of this Subject.

IN the preceding ſection I have repreſented this ſubject, as to me it appears conſiſtent with the truth. But ſince many eminent writers, who agree with me in the opinion itſelf, that this Epiſtle was a circular Epiſtle

intended for the joint uſe of the Epheſians, Laodiceans, and other Chriſtian communities, yet differ in their mode of ſtating it, I ought not to paſs over their ſentiments in ſilence.

Some ſuppoſe that in the place where we now read, τοις ἁγιοις τοις ουσιν εν Εφεσῳ, St. Paul wrote τοις ἁγιοις τοις ουσιν . . . . , with a blank ſpace after ουσιν, which was to be filled up in each copy by the name of the reſpective communities, as ſoon as the copies arrived at their place of deſtination. Now, though it is much more probable that St. Paul himſelf inſerted each name, before he ſent off the copies, yet there is a paſſage in the works of Baſil the Great, which appears at firſt ſight to favour the opinion of a vacancy, and which the advocates for this opinion have accordingly quoted. The paſſage is [k]: Αλλα και τοις Εφεσιοις επιστελλων, ὡς γνησιως ἡνωμενοις τῳ Ὀντι δι' επιγνωσεως, Ὀντας αυτους ιδιαζοντως ωνομασεν, ειπων, τοις ἁγιοις τοις Ουσι, και πιστοις εν Χριστῳ Ιησυ. Ὁυτω γαρ οἱ προ ἡμων παραδεδωκασι, και ἡμεις εν τοις παλαιοις των αντιγραφων εὑρηκαμεν. 'And writing (namely St. Paul) to the Epheſians, as truly united through knowledge to him *who is*, he called them in a peculiar ſenſe thoſe *who are*, ſaying: *To the ſaints who are, and the faithful in Chriſt Jeſus.* For thus our anceſtors have delivered it to us, and thus have we found it in ancient copies.'

Now before we attempt to judge of this paſſage, we muſt recollect that the Greeks uſed the word Ων in a very emphatical ſenſe, which we cannot eaſily expreſs by any ſingle word in modern languages. For inſtance in examining the queſtion, whether a ſubſtance, which is conſtantly changing its particles of matter, ſtill remains the ſame individual ſubſtance, they called that, which conſtituted its identity, το Ον. The Deity, who is unchangeable, is called therefore by Platonic philoſophers, eſpecially by Philo, ὁ Ων; and in the Septuagint alſo this title is applied to the Deity, Exod. iii. 14. Now this very paſſage of the Septuagint is applied by Baſil, to confute

[k] Baſilii Magni. Op. Tom. I. p. 743. or Tom. I. p. 254. ed. Garnier.

confute an error of Eunomius, and to prove that the Son of God exiſted from all eternity. On this occaſion he quotes ſeveral paſſages, where Εστι, in his opinion, is uſed of the true God in this emphatic ſenſe, in oppoſition to the falſe Gods, who are called μη οντες. Soon after he ſays that the heathens, who did not acknowledge the true God, were called τα μη οντα, Eſther xiv. 11. and 1 Cor. i. 28.: but that the Chriſtians, who worſhipped the true God, were called οι οντες. Finding therefore in the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, ch. i. 1. the expreſſion τοις ουσι, he takes it in the ſame emphatical ſenſe, and argues from it againſt the Eunomians, whom he refuſes to call οι οντες as being heretics. We, who are accuſtomed to a more rational mode of interpreting ſcripture, muſt conſider Baſil's mode of reaſoning on the words τοις ουσι as very abſurd. But it is of no conſequence to the preſent inquiry, whether he argued rationally or not. The only queſtion is, whether he did argue thus, which I think no one can doubt, who reads all his arguments in connexion. But if this be true, and the whole turns on the ſuppoſed emphatic ſenſe of τοις ουσι, the inference, which Uſher, Bengel, and ſeveral other eminent critics have drawn from this paſſage, is without foundation.

They argue, namely, thus. In our preſent text of the Epiſtle to the Epheſians we find, ch. i. 1, τοις αγιοις τοις ουσιν εν Εφεσῳ, και πιστοις εν Χριστῳ Ιησου: but the words which Baſil quotes from this place, as appears from the paſſage juſt alleged, are, τοις αγιοις τοις ουσι, και πιστοις εν Χριστῳ Ιησου, without εν Εφεσῳ. Hence it is inferred that in the Greek manuſcript, from which Baſil quoted, εν Εφεσῳ was omitted. But Baſil, at the very beginning of the paſſage, calls the Epiſtle, from which he quotes, an Epiſtle to the Epheſians, and therefore we muſt ſuppoſe that εν Εφεσῳ was not wanting in his copy. In anſwer to this reply it is again ſaid, that Baſil, in ſupport of the reading which he quotes, appeals to ancient manuſcripts, which he himſelf had ſeen, ſaying: ουτω —— και ημεις εν τοις παλαιοις των αντιγραφων ευρηκαμεν.

ευρηκαμεν. He muſt have meant therefore, as is inferred, to diſtinguiſh thoſe manuſcripts which had not εν Εφεσῳ, from thoſe which had it, and to give the former the preference. But this inference is without foundation: for Baſil not only ſays that this reading was in ancient manuſcripts, but ſays at the ſame time, ουτω οἱ προ ἡμων παραδεδωκασι: conſequently he makes the common reading and the reading of theſe ancient manuſcripts the ſame. That Baſil therefore omitted εν Εφεσῳ by deſign, and by authority, I do not believe. On the contrary, as his whole attention was directed to the word εσιν, and his whole argument is built upon it, I would rather conclude, that Baſil's appeal to Greek manuſcripts had reference only to εσι, which to him was of ſo much importance. For, it is not improbable, that, in the ſame manner as we find in Col. i. 2. τοις εν Κολοσσαις ἁγιοις, without εσιν, ſome few copies alſo of the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, in the time of Baſil, omitted the ſignificant word, and had only τοις ἁγιοις εν Εφεσῳ.

Dr. Koppe[1], if I underſtand him rightly, propoſes to omit, both εν Εφεσῳ, and τοις εσιν, and to read Epheſ. i. 1. thus, τοις ἁγιοις και πιστοις εν Χριστῳ Ιησυ. In ſupport of this argument, he appeals to the words of Tertullian quoted in the ſecond ſection of this chapter: 'eccleſiæ veritate epiſtolam iſtam ad Epheſios habemus emiſſam:' whence he concludes that, according to Tertullian, this Epiſtle was conſidered as having been ſent to the Epheſians, merely on the authority, that is, as Dr. Koppe explains it, on the tradition of the church. But whoever is converſant with the writings of Tertullian, muſt admit, that it was the uſual cuſtom of this Latin father to repreſent the church as the only depoſitary of faithful manuſcripts: nor does the expreſſion 'eccleſiæ veritas' neceſſarily denote merely oral tradition. Further, he appeals to another expreſſion of Tertullian in the ſame paſſage, 'Marcion et titulum aliquando interpolare geſtiit:' and thinking only on the ſuperſcription, προς Εφεσιους επιστολη Παυλου, he infers that in ch. i. 1. no mention

[1] Nov. Teſt. cum perpetuâ annotatione, p. 287. 288.

mention was made of Epheſus. But cannot the authentic ſuperſcription of an Epiſtle, for inſtance, Cicero S. D. Pompeio, or Trajanus Plinio, with equal reaſon have the name of 'titulus?' Beſides, the authority of Tertullian, in whatever manner the paſſage be explained, cannot be oppoſed to the united evidence of all the Greek manuſcripts and all the ancient verſions. If we were warranted to draw any inference, the only one would be this, that there were Latin copies in Africa, where Tertullian lived, in which the name of Epheſus was omitted: for as Tertullian was a Latin father, we cannot argue from what he ſays to Greek manuſcripts. But even this inference would be very precarious, becauſe all the Latin manuſcripts, of which we have any knowledge, read 'qui ſunt Epheſi,' in Epheſ. i. 1.

SECT. V.

Of the ſituation of the Chriſtian community at Epheſus: and the contents and ſtyle of the circular Epiſtle, which they received from St. Paul.

THE ſituation of the Chriſtian community at Epheſus I have already deſcribed in the fourteenth chapter[m], which relates to St. Paul's firſt Epiſtle to Timothy: to which place therefore I refer the reader, as containing all that is neceſſary on this ſubject[n], ſince the Epiſtle was not written ſolely to the Epheſians, but ſent to them jointly with other Chriſtian communities. On this account it contains nothing, which can diſtinguiſh it as an Epiſtle addreſſed to the inhabitants of Epheſus, as the two

[m] Sect. 2. 3. 4.

[n] Whoever wiſhes for more information, on the city and church of Epheſus, may conſult the Introduction to this Epiſtle by Salomon van Til, and G. Gude De eccleſiæ Epheſinæ ſtatu.

two Epiſtles to the Corinthians for inſtance diſtinguiſh themſelves from all other of St. Paul's Epiſtles by their alluſions to local circumſtances. Lardner indeed ſuppoſes [o], that St. Paul has in ſeveral inſtances made uſe of the architectural ſtyle, becauſe the Epheſians valued themſelves on the beautiful ſtructure of the temple of Diana, and as examples he quotes, ch. ii. 19—22. iii. 18. But this conjecture is too artificial, and it appears to me to be without foundation: nor indeed is it to be expected, that St. Paul, even in an Epiſtle intended ſolely for the Epheſians, ſhould uſe the technical terms of architecture, any more than I ſhould expect, that an Epiſtle on theological ſubjects addreſſed to perſons, who lived in a fortified town, ſhould contain alluſions to ravelins and baſtions.

Some commentators have ſuppoſed that this Epiſtle was addreſſed only to heathen converts. But this is hardly credible, becauſe the Chriſtians both at Epheſus, and in other cities of Aſia Minor, for which it was deſigned, conſiſted not only of heathen, but likewiſe of Jewiſh converts. Neither the commencement nor the cloſe of the Epiſtle warrants the concluſion: for both are expreſſed in general terms, ſo as to include converts of every deſcription, eſpecially the latter, which is, ch. vi. 24. 'Grace be with all them, that love our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in ſincerity.' The advocates for this opinion allege that St. Paul very frequently uſes the ſecond perſon plural 'Ye;' by which, they ſay, he underſtands only heathen converts in oppoſition to himſelf who was a Jewiſh convert. But it muſt be obſerved that St. Paul uſes alſo in this Epiſtle the firſt perſon plural, 'We,' and in theſe caſes we muſt conclude on the ſame ground that he meant to include the Jewiſh converts. In ch. i. 3—12. he conſtantly uſes 'We;' and ver. 13. he adds 'Ye alſo.' In like manner, ch. ii. 1. 2. he addreſſes the heathen converts in the ſecond perſon plural, as having been formerly idolaters: and ver. 3. he changes the perſon, ſaying, 'we alſo had our converſation in times

[o] Supplement, Vol. II. p. 393.

times paſt in the luſt of our fleſh, fulfilling the deſires of the fleſh, and of the mind, and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.' I admit however, that this Epiſtle is addreſſed principally to heathen converts, whom St. Paul means, where he ſpeaks in the ſecond perſon, reminding them of their former ſituation, and of the happineſs, which they had attained by their converſion from heatheniſm to Chriſtianity. We muſt conclude therefore, that from the accounts, which St. Paul had received concerning the ſituation of the Chriſtian communities, to which he ſent this Epiſtle, he did not think it ſo neceſſary to give particular inſtructions for the converts from Judaiſm.

In the three firſt chapters, St. Paul's principal object is to ſhew, that Jews and Gentiles partake of equal privileges and bleſſings in the kingdom of Chriſt, and that they are united in one church, or, as he expreſſes it, 'an holy Temple in the Lord.' He deſcribes Jeſus Chriſt as being 'the chief corner ſtone:' and ch. iii. 18. he again alludes to this temple, ſpeaking of its length, breadth, height, and depth. Now if I underſtand St. Paul rightly, he means that the temple, of which Chriſt was the head corner ſtone, comprehended the length and breadth of the whole earth, that in its height it extended to heaven, and in its depth to the regions of the dead[p]. This doctrine was very proper for mixed communities conſiſting partly of Jewiſh and partly of Gentile converts: and, if we attend to the diſtinction, which St. Paul makes in this Epiſtle between 'we' and 'ye,' we ſhall more eaſily perceive its application. From this doctrine he makes a tranſition in the fourth chapter to the unity of the church: which, he ſays, muſt not be diſturbed by the difference, which ſubſiſted between the ſpiritual gifts, and by a ſuperiority, which they who had a greater ſhare, claimed over the reſt. St. Paul aſſures them, that theſe ſpiritual gifts, various as they were, were given for one common purpoſe, and that the

[p] I ſhall ſay more on this paſſage in the Expoſition of the Epiſtle to the Epheſians.

the members of every Chriſtian community, however different their talents, were members of the ſame body. This affords him an opportunity of explaining the nature and deſign of ſpiritual gifts, from which it appears, that ſuch as were ſupernatural were not intended to laſt for ever, but only during the infancy of the church, or as long as it was in danger of being overturned by 'every word of doctrine, and the ſleight of men.' But on this ſubject I ſhall ſay more in the Expoſition of this Epiſtle.

Another object, which St. Paul had in view, was to ſhew that the advantages, which both the Jewiſh and Gentile converts received from the Chriſtian religion, were to be attributed to Chriſt alone, and not to the intervention of any other ſuperior Beings, by whatever names they are called, whether Archangels according to our language, or Æons according to the language of the Gnoſtics. In the communities therefore, to which this Epiſtle was addreſſed, the Gnoſtic and Eſſene notions of intermediate ſpirits muſt have prevailed: for St. Paul not only alludes, in this Epiſtle, much more than in the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, to the doctrines of the Gnoſtics, but uſes even the technical terms of their philoſophy, eſpecially in ch. ii. 2. vi. 1. and this uſe of Gnoſtic terms is ſo remarkable, that I once heard a man celebrated for his learning and abilities, expreſs a doubt on this very account, whether St. Paul was the author of this Epiſtle. But St. Paul adopted the Gnoſtic terms, in order to combat their doctrines, which, as appears from the contents of this Epiſtle, muſt have been introduced in the Chriſtian communities, to which he ſent it. That this is true of the Epheſian church we ſee from 1 Tim. vi. 20. 21.: and many other cities of Aſia Minor were probably infected with the ſame notions.

Whoever reads with attention Epheſ. ii. 1—12. which is the firſt paſſage of this Epiſtle, where St. Paul makes uſe of Gnoſtic expreſſions, muſt obſerve, that the ſubject relates to heatheniſm and idolatry, to which the greateſt part of thoſe, to whom the Apoſtle wrote, were formerly addicted: and even the other paſſage,

ch. vi. 11, 12. appears to me to relate, not ſo much to the immediate temptation of the devil, as to the temptation to idolatry, which is the ſervice of the devil. This leads me to the conjecture, that idolatry, which had been baniſhed by Chriſtianity, had again attempted to inſinuate itſelf under the maſk of the Gnoſis, which was itſelf nothing more than a ſyſtem of heatheniſm and polytheiſm.

The moral part of this Epiſtle, which begins with ch. iv. 17. is, as well as the preceding part, very ſimilar to the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, and in many places almoſt exactly agrees with it. But as we know not for how many different communities this Epiſtle was deſigned, and therefore with the exception of the Epheſians, are unable to judge of the particular ſituation of thoſe perſons who received it, we cannot eaſily aſſign the motive, which influenced St. Paul in the choice of thoſe moral doctrines, which he delivered in it. But though the motive is unknown to us, he certainly ſelected theſe moral doctrines with ſome particular view. Throughout the whole Epiſtle we find no mention made of particular faults or reigning vices, and for this very reaſon, that it was a circular Epiſtle, and not deſigned for any one church excluſively. Hence this Epiſtle contains fewer cenſures, than the generality of St. Paul's Epiſtles. But we muſt not therefore conclude, that all the communities, to which St. Paul ſent it, were ſo exemplary in their conduct, as not to merit cenſure: ſince we ſee that the circumſtance of its being a circular Epiſtle prevented St. Paul from entering into a detail of the faults peculiar to any one community. And that they had their faults we may conclude from the caution, which he has given them, ch. v. 5. 6. 'This ye know that no whoremonger, nor unclean perſon, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Chriſt, and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words.' By the expreſſion 'vain words' (κενοις λογοις) St. Paul probably meant the empty and falſe doctrines of ſome of the heathen philoſophers, eſpecially among the Greeks, and likewiſe of ſome of the Gnoſtics, who

maintained,

maintained, that the indulgence of ſenſuality was not a crime. In ch. v. 22—35. he gives directions for the conduct of married perſons, and repreſents matrimony as a holy ſtate, by comparing the union of man and wife with the union of Chriſt and his church. Perhaps in this compariſon, he intended to combat indirectly the doctrine of the Eſſenes, who aſſerted that matrimony was an unholy ſtate, and unworthy of a wiſe man.

With reſpect to the ſtyle of this Epiſtle, it muſt be obſerved that there is a peculiarity in it, which makes this Epiſtle in ſome meaſure more difficult to be underſtood, than any other of St. Paul's Epiſtles. Each ſingle word is perfectly intelligible: but the ſentences are ſo long, and the members, of which each ſentence conſiſts, are at the ſame time ſo ſhort, that they are frequently capable of many different conſtructions, of which we cannot eaſily determine which is the right one. If a paſſage therefore of this Epiſtle were taken unpointed, ſome would place the commas in one place, ſome in another: and, what increaſes the difficulty is, that in our common editions of the Greek Teſtament, the points are placed with much leſs judgement in this Epiſtle, than in any other part [q]. The Epiſtle to the Coloſſians alſo contains in ſome places long periods, with ſhort clauſes, but not in an equal degree with the Epiſtle to the Epheſians. The cauſe of this peculiarity in the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, to which every commentator ought eſpecially to attend, I will not attempt to aſſign [r]. We cannot aſcribe it to the circumſtance of St. Paul's advanced age: for the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, which was written ſtill later, has as fluent language as any other of St. Paul's Epiſtles.

[q] See Vol. II. Ch. xiii. Sect. 4. of this Introduction.

[r] There is one paſſage however, in which I will hazard a conjecture, In ch. vi. 11. 13—16. St. Paul has a very long metaphor taken from the ſeveral parts of offenſive and defenſive armour, in ſome of which I have doubts in regard to the application. But the queſtion here to be aſked is: Was this long continued metaphor occaſioned by St. Paul's ſituation, when he wrote this Epiſtle, he being then in cuſtody at Rome, and watched by ſoldiers of the imperial life-guard? Compare Acts xxviii. 16. with Phil. I. 13.

CHAP. XXI.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

SECT. I.

Of the city Philippi, and the ſtate of the Chriſtian community there.

ST. PAUL had eſtabliſhed a Chriſtian community at Philippi, on the journey through Macedonia, which St. Luke has deſcribed, Acts xvi. 12—40. and of which I have given an account, Ch. xi. Sect. 1. Philippi was a city of Macedonia, of moderate extent, and not far from the borders of Thrace. It was formerly called Crenides, from its numerous ſprings, from which ariſes a ſmall ſtream, mentioned Acts xvi. 13. though it is commonly omitted in the maps. The name of Philippi it received from Philip, father of Alexander, who enlarged it, and fortified it as a barrier town againſt the Thracians. Julius Cæſar ſent hither a Roman colony, as appears from the following inſcription on a medal of this city, COL. IUL. AUG. PHIL. quoted in Vaillant Num. æn. imp. T. I. p. 160, and from Spon Miſc. p. 173. See alſo Pliny, L. IV. c. 11. and the authors in Wolfii Curæ, in the note to Acts xvi. 12. St. Luke calls Philippi, πρωτη της μεριδος της Μακεδονιας πολις, 'the firſt city of that diſtrict of Macedonia;' but in what ſenſe the word πρωτη, or 'firſt,' is here to be taken admits of ſome doubt. Paulus Æmilius had divided Macedonia into four diſtricts, and that, in which Philippi was ſituate, was called πρωτη, or the firſt diſtrict. But of this diſtrict Philippi does not appear to be entitled in any ſenſe to the name of πρωτη πολις. For if πρωτη be taken in the ſenſe of 'firſt in reſpect to place', this title belonged rather to Neapolis, which was the frontier

town

town of Macedonia toward Thrace, as appears from Acts xvii. 1. And, if it be taken in the ſenſe of 'firſt in reſpect to rank,' it belonged rather to Amphipolis, which was the capital of this diſtrict of Macedonia, as appears from the following paſſage in Livii Hiſt. Lib. XLV. 29. Capita regionum, ubi concilia fierent, primæ regionis Amphipolin, ſecundæ Theſſalonicen, &c. But the difficulty is not ſo great as it appears to be. For, though Amphipolis was made the capital of the firſt diſtrict of Macedonia in the time of Paulus Æmilius, and therefore entitled to the name of πρωτη, it is not impoſſible that in a ſubſequent age the preference was given to Philippi. Or even if Amphipolis ſtill continued to be the capital of the diſtrict, or the ſeat of the Roman provincial government, yet the title πρωτη may have been claimed by the city Philippi, though it were not the very firſt in point of rank. We meet with many inſtances of this kind, on the medals of the Greek cities, on which we find that more than one city of the ſame province aſſumed the title of πρωτη [s]. St. Luke therefore, who ſpent a long time at Philippi, and was well acquainted with

[s] In Boze's diſſertation on a coin of the city of Smyrna, printed in the 17th volume of the Memoires de l'Academie des Inſcriptions et Belles Lettres, are quoted ſeveral examples, though they are not applied there to the preſent queſtion. For inſtance, on the medals ſtruck at Nicæa in Bithynia, this city was called ΠΡΩΤΗ ΤΗΣ ΕΠΑΡΧΙΑΣ, (ſee p. 3. of this diſſertation): yet the title πρωτη was likewiſe aſſumed by Nicomedia, on a coin of which city we find ΝΙΚΟΜΗΔΕΙΑ Η ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΩΤΗ ΒΙΘΥΝΙΑΣ. Another coin of Nicomedia ſtruck in the time of Trajan has ΝΙΚΟΜΗΔΕΙΑ Η ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΩΤΗ ΠΟΝΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΒΙΘΥΝΙΑΣ. (p. 4) Now ſince the conciſeneſs of inſcriptions on medals does not uſually permit an unneceſſary repetition of the ſame thing in different words, we muſt conclude that πρωτη was not ſynonymous to μητροπολις. In the Proconſular Aſia, Epheſus was properly the capital; yet both Smyrna and Pergamus aſſumed the title πρωτη. Boze (p. 5. 6.) mentions not only an Epheſian coin with the inſcription ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΑΣΙΑΣ, but a coin of Pergamus with ΠΕΡΓΑΜΗΝΩΝ ΠΡΩΤΩΝ, though without ΑΣΙΑΣ, and two coins of Smyrna, the one inſcribed ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΑΣΙΑΣ, the other ΠΡΩΤΗ ΑΣ ΑΣ ΚΑΛΛΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΓΕΘΕΙ. In conſequence of theſe pretenſions of Smyrna and Pergamus, the Epheſians inſcribed their coins ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ ΜΟΝΩΝ ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΑΣΙΑΣ.

with the cuſtoms of the place, gave this city the title which it claimed, and which, according to the cuſtom of the Greek cities, was inſcribed probably on its coins. Hence it appears that the propoſal made by Pierce to alter πρωτη της μεριδος to πρωτης μεριδος is unneceſſary.

From the contents of this Epiſtle we learn that the moſt dangerous ſeducers, againſt whom it was neceſſary to warn the Philippians, were the Phariſaical Jews, or zealots for the law of Moſes. Further, we perceive that the Chriſtian community at Philippi ſent to St. Paul a regular ſtipend, or an annual ſtated preſent, ch. i. 5. iv. 15—17. This annual preſent had been ſent to the Apoſtle by the hands of Epaphroditus, as deputy from the Philippians; who at the ſame time aſſiſted him in propagating the Goſpel in Italy, St. Paul himſelf being priſoner in Rome, which aſſiſtance brought on Epaphroditus a very ſevere and dangerous illneſs, ch. ii. 25—30. Daubuz, in his firſt book De teſtimonio Chriſti apud Joſephum, P. III. §. 8. repreſents this Epaphroditus as a perſon of great diſtinction, ſuppoſing him to be the Epaphroditus, who was a freed-man of Nero, and who encouraged Joſephus to write his Jewiſh Antiquities. But ſince many perſons within the compaſs of the Roman Empire might have borne the name of Epaphroditus, the identity, though poſſible, cannot be ſaid to be probable. And if we take into the account, that Joſephus wrote his Jewiſh Antiquities at the requeſt of Nero's freed-man, the ſuppoſition becomes even improbable: for, if the freed-man of Nero was the ſame, as the Epaphroditus who was deputed by the Philippians, he was a zealous Chriſtian, and conſequently he would not have patroniſed the works of Joſephus. The Jewiſh ſeducers, who were undoubtedly of the new Phariſaic ſect founded by Judas Galilæus, are deſcribed by St. Paul, ch. iii. 2. 18. 19. in very ſtrong terms, as men of reprobate character: and they appear to have been exactly of the ſame ſtamp, as the ſeducers of the Galatians, of whom I have given an account, Ch. xi. Sect. 2.

As

As the Philippians had thrice [t] ſent to St. Paul their annual preſent, previous to that, which they ſent by the hands of Epaphroditus, it is probable that he had not received theſe preſents in ſilence, but that he had made ſome written acknowledgement. One might conclude therefore that he had already written to them ſeveral Epiſtles: a concluſion, which is corroborated by what the Apoſtle himſelf ſays, ch. iii. 1. 18. eſpecially in the latter place, where he writes thus to the Philippians, 'For many walk, of whom *I have told you often*, and now tell you even weeping, that they are enemies of the croſs of Chriſt.'

In the exordium of this Epiſtle, we find, contrary to St. Paul's general practice, biſhops and deacons mentioned in the general ſalutation: πασι τοις αγιοις τοις ουσιν εν Φιλιπποις συν επισκοποις και διακονοις, ch. i. 1. The moſt probable reaſon for this deviation is that aſſigned by Theophylact, namely, that they were the perſons, who had ſent Epaphroditus, to bring the contributions of the Philippian community [u]. St. Paul therefore greeted them in particular in this Epiſtle, which he did not in his Epiſtles to other churches, becauſe the Philippians alone contributed to his neceſſities, as he himſelf ſays in his Epiſtle to them. But he firſt mentions the members of the community at large, and then the biſhops and deacons, as miniſters of the church. That there were ſeveral biſhops at Philippi will not appear extraordinary to any one, who reflects on the ſtate of the Chriſtian communities in the time of the Apoſtles. In that age the Chriſtians had no public edifices or temples, which contained, as in later ages, an aſſembly of ſeveral thouſands, but were obliged to hold their meetings in private

[t] See Phil. IV. 16.

[u] The words of Theophylact are: Τινος δε χαριν τω κληρω νυν γραφει, ὁπερ οὐδαμου αλλαχου εποιησεν; Ὁτι αυτοι τον Επαφροδιτον επεμψαν επαγομενον τα προς χρειαν τω αποστολω. It may at the ſame time be obſerved that this very addreſs to the biſhops and deacons in the exordium to the Epiſtle to the Philippians, and its being a deviation from the addreſs in all St. Paul's other Epiſtles, is ſufficient to confute the opinion maintained by Dr. Semler that St. Paul's Epiſtles were all deſigned for the excluſive uſe of the clergy.

private houſes. Where the Chriſtians were numerous, theſe meetings, and conſequently the inſpectors, or biſhops, who preſided in them, were multiplied in proportion: for no room in a private houſe could hold a very numerous congregation. This order of things continued, till by degrees the juriſdiction of Chriſtian biſhops extended itſelf to whole cities, to whole dioceſes, and at length to whole principalities.

In ch. iv. 2. St. Paul ſpeaks of Evodia and Syntyche, as two very excellent women, but who unfortunately were at variance: and the difference, which ſubſiſted between them, appears to have occaſioned likewiſe a diviſion in the whole community. If we judge from their names, they were not Jewiſh, but Greek women, who before their converſion to Chriſtianity, had adopted perhaps the Jewiſh religion, and therefore, according to the language of the Acts of the Apoſtles were γυναικες σεβομεναι, like Lydia, mentioned Acts xvi. 14. As perſons of rank and fortune, they muſt have had material influence on the other members of the community, whom St. Paul deſcribes, 2 Cor. viii. 2. as being in general poor. Whether they had an office in the church, or not, no one at preſent can determine. It is indeed not impoſſible, that they were deaconeſſes, and made their houſes places of aſſembly: but no one can aſſert it, ſince we have no knowledge on this ſubject. Both Evodia and Syntyche appear to have been in the wrong: St. Paul therefore adviſes them to be reconciled to each other, and requeſts a friend, whoſe name he has not mentioned, to take upon him the office of mediator [w].

[w] Ἐρωτω και σε, συζυγε γνησιε, συλλαμβανου αυταις, αἱτινες ἐν τῳ ευαγγελιῳ συνηθλησαν μοι, μετα καὶ Κλημεντος και των λοιπων συνεργων μου, ὠν τα ονοματα ἐν βιβλῳ ζωης. Ch. iv. 3. Beſide the mediator therefore, whoſe name St. Paul has not mentioned, it might be thought that Clement was alſo requeſted to co-operate in effecting a reconciliation. But inſtead of conſtruing μετα και Κλημεντος with ἐρωτω και σε, I would rather conſtrue it with συνηθλησαν μοι, and ſuppoſe that St. Paul meant to ſay, that Evodia and Syntyche had combated for the Goſpel, together with Clement (by whom I underſtand Clement of Rome) and

SECT. II.

St. Paul wrote the Epiſtle to the Philippians, during his firſt impriſonment in Rome, at a time, when he expected to be ſoon releaſed.

THAT St. Paul was priſoner in Rome, when he wrote the Epiſtle to the Philippians, appears from ch. i. 13. where he ſays that his bonds were known to the whole prætorian guard: and ch. iv. 22. he ſends a ſalutation from 'Cæſar's houſhold.' Mr. Oeder, in a Programma publiſhed in 1731, has indeed attempted to ſhew, that this Epiſtle was written at a much earlier period, and not long after the converſion of the Philippians to Chriſtianity: but his arguments have been ſo completely anſwered by Wolf in his Prolegemena to this Epiſtle, that it is unneceſſary to ſay any thing further on this ſubject. I muſt make however one obſervation on what Oeder ſays of κοινωνια εις το ευαγγελιον, ch. i. 5. which he explains of the contribution of the Philippians toward the propagation of the Goſpel. Now I grant, that the Philippians ſent to St. Paul an annual preſent, to aſſiſt him in propagating the Goſpel: but I do not admit that this paſſage warrants the concluſion, that St. Paul wrote the Epiſtle to the Philippians, ſoon after he received the firſt contribution; for he adds 'from the firſt day until now,' from which we ſee that theſe contributions had been repeated ſeveral times. In fact, from theſe annual contributions we may conclude that ſome years had elapſed between the converſion of the Philippians and the writing of this Epiſtle. St. Paul himſelf

and the Apoſtle's other fellow-labourers, whoſe names are in the book of life.' If this be true we muſt conclude that Evodia and Syntyche had been with St. Paul in Rome: whither he had ſent for them perhaps, in order to bear teſtimony to his conduct in Macedonia, where he had been accuſed of preaching ſedition, Acts xvi. 20. 21. xvii. 6. 7. ——What I have ſaid in this note, I give only as conjecture, and not as fact.

himſelf acknowledges, ch. iv. 16. that he had twice received this annual preſent, beſide that which the Philippians had ſent to him at Theſſalonica, and what I grant was ſoon after their converſion. When he returned to Philippi on his journey through Macedonia mentioned Acts xx. 1. he undoubtedly returned them thanks in perſon for the preſents, which he had already received: and the impriſonment of St. Paul in Cæſarea and Rome, which happened ſhortly after, muſt have prevented the ſending of their annual bounty during ſome years, to which St. Paul alludes, ch. iv. 10, 11. If it be objected, that between the converſion of the Philippians and the year 60[x], more than four payments muſt have been made, I anſwer that in thoſe times there was not that regular and eaſy communication between diſtant countries, which there is at preſent, in conſequence of the eſtabliſhment of poſts, and the circulation of mercantile drafts: and therefore the Philippians had it not in their power to remit their annual contribution at a ſtated period, but were obliged to wait, till they met with a convenient opportunity.

It is evident that the Epiſtle to the Philippians was not written at the ſame time with thoſe to the Epheſians and Coloſſians: and I think it equally clear that it was written later than thoſe Epiſtles. St. Luke accompanied St. Paul to Rome, and ſtaid with him there at leaſt two years. Now St. Paul wrote his Epiſtles to the Epheſians and the Coloſſians while St. Luke was with him, as appears from Col. iv. 14. Philem. 24. But St. Luke had certainly left him, before he wrote his Epiſtle to the Philippians: for ſince St. Luke ſpent many years at Philippi[y], and was therefore well known to the Chriſtian community there, St. Paul would not have omitted to ſend a ſalutation from him to the Philippians, if he had been ſtill in Rome. Beſides, as St. Paul wrote the Epiſtle to the Philippians, not only in his own name but

[x] See above, Ch. viii. Sect. 4.

[y] He ſtaid at Philippi during the time of St. Paul's travels, related Acts xvi. 1—xx. 5, 6. See the laſt paragraph of Ch. vi. Sect. 3.

but likewiſe in that of Timothy, beginning thus, ch. i. 1. Paul and Timothy ſervants of Jeſus Chriſt, &c.: I think, that if St. Luke had likewiſe been preſent, his name alſo would have been added in the exordium, to which he had certainly as good a claim, if not a better, than Timothy. But, what is ſtill more deciſive, St. Paul ſays, ii. 19, 20. 'I truſt in the Lord Jeſus to ſend Timothy ſhortly unto you, that I alſo may be of good comfort, when I know your ſtate. For I have no man like-minded, who will naturally care for your ſtate.' Surely St. Paul could not have written thus, if his fellow-labourer St. Luke had been with him.

The ſituation of St. Paul, as a priſoner, was likewiſe different, when he wrote his Epiſtle to the Philippians, from that, in which he wrote to the Epheſians, and Coloſſians. It is true, that even when he wrote to the Epheſians and Coloſſians, his confinement was not ſevere, nor his proſpects gloomy: but when he wrote to the Philippians, his ſituation was greatly improved, and his expectations much more favourable. He ſays, ch. i. 12—14. 'My bonds in Chriſt are manifeſt in all the palace, and in all other places: and many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to ſpeak the word without fear[z].' And ch. iv. 22. he ſays, 'All the ſaints ſalute you, chiefly they that are of Cæſar's houſhold:' whence it appears that the Chriſtian religion had been introduced into the imperial palace. That he expected, and was even confident, that he ſhould be ſoon releaſed, is evident from what he ſays, ch. i. 25. 26. 'Having this confidence I know (τουτο πεποιθως οιδα) that I ſhall abide and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith: that your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jeſus Chriſt for me, by my coming to you again.' And he is ſo confident of his releaſe, that he ſays, ch. ii. 24. 'I truſt in the Lord, that I alſo myſelf ſhall come ſhortly.'

The

[z] He adds likewiſe ver. 15. that ſome Jewiſh-minded perſons preached Chriſt alſo of envy and ſtrife.

The two laſt-quoted paſſages afford a ſtrong argument in favour of the opinion, that St. Paul was twice priſoner in Rome, and conſequently, that the Epiſtle to the Philippians was written during the firſt impriſonment. The ſtrong expreſſion πεποιθως οιδα, ch. i. 24. eſpecially as St. Paul had immediately before deliberated, whether it were better for him to live or to die, appears to imply, that he ſpake in the ſpirit of prophecy, and with an actual aſſurance of being releaſed. Whoever therefore believes that St. Paul was inſpired, muſt conclude that his expectations were fulfilled, that he was actually releaſed, that his martyrdom therefore did not take place at the end of this impriſonment, and conſequently that he underwent a ſecond. On the other hand, they who aſſert that St. Paul ſpake in this paſſage merely from the ſuggeſtions of human wiſdom, may contend that, though he had every reaſon to expect, when he wrote to the Philippians, that he ſhould ſoon be releaſed, his proſpects might have ſuddenly changed; for before the cloſe of the year, in which this Epiſtle was written, namely, in the year 65, the Chriſtians really underwent a ſevere perſecution from Nero, who charged them with having ſet fire to Rome, in order to remove the ſuſpicion of his having been himſelf the perpetrator.

That the Epiſtle to the Philippians was written at the beginning of the year 65, appears from various circumſtances. It could not have been written before the year 65, becauſe it was written after the period, with which St. Luke cloſes the Acts of the Apoſtles. Nor could it have been written after the year 65, or even ſo late as the end of that year, becauſe in that year the conflagration of Rome happened, which was followed by a ſevere perſecution of the Chriſtians[a]: and an Epiſtle written after that perſecution would certainly have repreſented both the proſpects of St. Paul himſelf, and the ſtate of Chriſtianity at Rome, in a different manner from that, which we find in the Epiſtle to the Philippians. Nor would Jewiſh impoſtors have ventured after that perſecution

[a] Taciti Annal. Lib. XV. c. 44.

cution to preach the Chriſtian religion, though they preached it in a manner, which provoked St. Paul [b].

The more immediate occaſion of this Epiſtle was the return of Epaphroditus, by whom St. Paul ſent it, as a grateful acknowledgement of the money, which he had received. At the ſame time he gave them an account of his confinement in Rome, and warned them againſt the ſeductions of the Jews.

CHAP. XXII.

OF THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

SECT. I.

Of the place, where Timothy was, when St. Paul wrote to him his ſecond Epiſtle.

IT is generally ſuppoſed that Timothy was at Epheſus, when St. Paul wrote to him the ſecond Epiſtle, as he was, when St. Paul wrote to him the firſt: but as this admits of ſome doubt, it will be neceſſary to examine it more cloſely. That Timothy was at leaſt ſomewhere in Aſia Minor, when St. Paul wrote to him the ſecond Epiſtle, appears to be probable from ch. iv. 13. where Timothy is requeſted to bring with him ſome things, which St. Paul had left in Troas. But that Timothy paſſed through Troas in his way to St. Paul is not a neceſſary conſequence, ſince he might have ſent to Troas for the things, which St. Paul requeſted him to bring. Still leſs can we infer from this paſſage, that Timothy was then in Epheſus: and the only probable inference, which we can deduce, is, that Timothy was ſomewhere in Aſia Minor.

The

[b] Ch. i. 15—18.

The advocates for the opinion, that Timothy was then in Epheſus, allege, that St. Paul ſpeaks in this Epiſtle of ſeveral perſons, who reſided in Epheſus, and relates to Timothy in what manner he had been treated by them, on their meeting in Rome: whence it is inferred, that Timothy was then in Epheſus. But this inference is very precarious. For, as Timothy was particularly acquainted with the Epheſian community, and had even appointed biſhops there, he would have been intereſted in the conduct of the Epheſians, even if he had not been then reſident among them: and St. Paul therefore, even in this caſe, might have thought proper to inform Timothy that all the Chriſtians of Aſia Minor had deſerted him [c], and that Alexander the copper-ſmith was one of his principal adverſaries.

Further, appeal is made to the following paſſages.

1. St. Paul ſalutes, ch. iv. 19. the houſe of Oneſiphorus; and from ch. i. 16—18. is inferred that Oneſiphorus was an inhabitant of Epheſus.

Now it is true, that St. Paul in the laſt-quoted paſſage, after having mentioned the favours, which he had received from Oneſiphorus, when he was in Rome, adds, 'and in how many things he miniſtered unto me at Epheſus thou knoweſt very well.' But this is no proof that Oneſiphorus was an inhabitant of Epheſus: for, in the ſame manner, as he was a ſtranger in Rome, when he miniſtered to St. Paul there, he might have been likewiſe a ſtranger at Epheſus, when he ſhewed to St. Paul a ſimilar kindneſs.

2. Lardner alleges, that St. Paul in the very ſame verſe, in which he ſalutes the houſe of Oneſiphorus, ſalutes alſo Aquilas and Priſcilla, who reſided ſome time at Epheſus, as appears from Acts xviii. 18, 19. 26.

Now that they had reſided ſome time at Epheſus, I grant: but it does not therefore follow, that they were there, when St. Paul wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy. That they had left Epheſus, and were returned

[c] Ch. i. 15.

turned to Rome, before St. Paul wrote his Epiſtle to the Romans, is evident from Rom. xvi. 3.: and whither they went, when they again left Rome, is a matter wholly uncertain. As Aquilas was a native of Pontus[d], he may as well be ſuppoſed to have gone to ſome city in that country, as to any other part of Aſia Minor. Beſides, as Aquilas was by profeſſion an inſtrument-maker, as I ſhall ſhew in the following chapter, it is probable that he frequently changed the place of his abode, in order to promote the ſale of his wares.

3. St. Paul adviſes Timothy to be on his guard againſt Alexander the copper-ſmith, ch. iv. 15. who is ſuppoſed to be the ſame as the Alexander mentioned Acts xix. 33. who was an Epheſian, and at the inſtigation of the Jews, acted the part of an orator, in ſtirring up the people againſt St. Paul. Now I admit that the Alexander, againſt whom St. Paul warns Timothy, and who had lately taken an active part againſt St. Paul, was the ſame as the Alexander, who had formerly oppoſed St. Paul at Epheſus: but I do not therefore admit, that Timothy was neceſſarily at Epheſus, when St. Paul wrote to him. For, even if Timothy had been in ſome other town of Aſia Minor, the Apoſtle might have thought it neceſſary to guard him againſt ſo dangerous and active an adverſary, who did not confine his perſecution to one place, but after having accuſed St. Paul at Epheſus, had followed him ſome years afterwards as far as Rome.

However, though no one of the preceding arguments, taken by itſelf, is ſufficient to prove, that Timothy was at Epheſus, when St. Paul wrote to him his ſecond Epiſtle, yet their united force will render the opinion not improbable, till poſitive arguments can be brought on the other ſide of the queſtion. Now there are really two arguments againſt the opinion that Timothy was at Epheſus.

1. St. Paul ſays, ch. iv. 12. 'Tychicus have I ſent to Epheſus.' Hence we may argue, that Timothy was not

[d] Acts xviii. 2.

not at Epheſus; for, if he had been there, he would have known of the arrival of Tychicus, without being informed of it by St. Paul.

Lardner has endeavoured to anſwer this objection: but he did not perceive its full force. For he attempts only to ſhew, what no one will deny, that, if Timothy was at Epheſus, it was the ſame thing, whether St. Paul ſaid, I have ſent Tychicus to thee, or I have ſent Tychicus to Epheſus.

2. St. Paul ſays, ch. iv. 20. 'Trophimus have I left at Miletus ſick.' Now, if Timothy had been at Epheſus, he muſt have known this circumſtance, without having been informed by St. Paul, as Miletus was not far diſtant: eſpecially ſince Trophimus was an Epheſian, as we ſee from Acts xxi. 29.

The arguments therefore on each ſide of the queſtion appear to me to counterpoiſe each other in ſuch a manner, as to leave the queſtion undecided. In fact, it is not improbable, that St. Paul himſelf did not exactly know in what city of Aſia Minor Timothy would receive the Epiſtle, which he was writing to him: for, as Timothy was very active in propagating the Goſpel, we may conclude that he frequently removed from one town to another. And as Aſia Minor was not only at ſome diſtance from Italy, but ſeparated from it by two ſeas, the communication between St. Paul and Timothy cannot be ſuppoſed to have been ſo regular, that the former always knew where the latter reſided. Though St. Paul knew not exactly, where Timothy was, he might have written to him an Epiſtle, and have entruſted it to a ſafe perſon, who was travelling into Aſia Minor, with an order to deliver it to him, wherever he found him.

SECT. II.

Whether this Epiſtle was written, while St. Paul was priſoner for the firſt time in Rome, or during a ſecond impriſonment there.

THAT St. Paul was a priſoner, when he wrote this Epiſtle, is evident from ch. i. 8. 12. 16. ii. 9. and that his impriſonment was in Rome appears from ch. i. 17. But the queſtion to be aſked is, whether he wrote it during the impriſonment recorded by St. Luke in the laſt chapter of the Acts: or whether he wrote it during a ſecond impriſonment there. This queſtion will likewiſe involve another, namely, whether the old tradition, that St. Paul was twice priſoner in Rome, be really true.

It is obvious from the contents of this Epiſtle, that at the time, when St. Paul wrote it, his ſituation was very different from that, in which he wrote the Epiſtles to the Epheſians, Coloſſians, Philemon, and the Philippians. For theſe Epiſtles diſcover very advantageous proſpects, and ſhew that the Apoſtle expected to be ſoon releaſed: whereas the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy plainly indicates, that he had then no other expectation, than that of an approaching death. When he wrote the Epiſtle to the Philippians, his cauſe had taken ſo favourable a turn, that many, even intereſted Jews, had been induced to preach the Goſpel. But, when he wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, his ſituation was ſuch, that every one of thoſe, who were formerly his friends, had deſerted him, excepting St. Luke[e]. Further, St. Luke was not with him, when he wrote the Epiſtle to the Philippians: and again, the perſons, from whom he ſends ſalutations in the ſecond

[e] Ch. iv. 11.

ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, ch. iv. 21. are not mentioned in any of St. Paul's former Epiſtles, and appear therefore to have been perſons, with whom Timothy, who was in Rome, when St. Paul wrote his Epiſtles to the Coloſſians and Philippians, had then made an acquaintance. Hence it is evident, that the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written under different circumſtances, and at a different time from the above-mentioned Epiſtles. It muſt likewiſe appear highly probable, merely from this ſtatement, that it was written later. But from this ſtatement alone, we muſt not immediately conclude, that it was written during a ſecond impriſonment: for it ſtill remains poſſible, that St. Paul was only once priſoner in Rome, and that the favourable expectations, and the hopes of a releaſe, which he had in the former part of it, were changed before he wrote the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy; eſpecially in the year 65, when the Chriſtians underwent a ſevere perſecution from Nero. But, if this be true, and St. Paul remained priſoner in Rome from the time of his firſt arrival there to the time of his martyrdom, it muſt at leaſt be admitted, that the Apoſtle wrote the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy toward the cloſe of this impriſonment, and ſhortly before his death.

Lardner[f], on the ſuppoſition that St. Paul was twice priſoner in Rome, has taken great pains to prove, that the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written during St. Paul's firſt impriſonment there. But though Lardner's arguments on this ſubject are very numerous, they are totally ineffective. However, as he has collected almoſt every thing, which can be ſaid on this ſide of the queſtion, the reader will do well to conſult him. The other ſide of the queſtion, namely, that this Epiſtle was written during a ſecond impriſonment in Rome, is very ably, and very impartially ſupported by Moſheim

[f] Supplement to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, Vol. II. p. 226—274.

Moſheim in his Expoſition of the two Epiſtles to Timothy[g].

The main queſtion, for the ſake of greater perſpicuity, may be divided into the four following parts.

1. Was this Epiſtle written during St. Paul's firſt impriſonment in Rome?

2. Or during a ſecond impriſonment there?

3. If St. Paul was only once priſoner in Rome, was it written in the former part of this impriſonment?

4. Or toward the cloſe of it?

Before I proceed to the examination of theſe queſtions, I muſt obſerve, what Moſheim indeed has already noticed, that the firſt queſtion in ſome meaſure involves an abſurdity. For the opinion that St. Paul was twice priſoner in Rome is ſupported by no hiſtorical evidence[h], and the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy alone can furniſh a proof, that he was actually releaſed the firſt time, that he left Rome, that he afterwards returned thither, and was again impriſoned. It is true, that an exception may be made for the argument, which I deduced in the ſecond ſection of the preceding chapter, from Phil. i. 25. (where St. Paul confidently ſpeaks of an approaching releaſe) in favour of the opinion, that he was actually releaſed, on the ſuppoſition, that the confident expectations of an inſpired man could not be diſappointed. But, as theologians both in ancient and in modern times have doubted, whether St. Paul was endued with a prophetic ſpirit, in matters relating to his own life and fortune, it may be diſputed, whether his expectations were fulfilled. Inſtead therefore of inquiring, whether the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written during St. Paul's firſt impriſonment in Rome, we ſhould aſk whether it was written in the former part of his impriſonment there. Now that this is highly improbable appears from what has been already ſaid in this ſection.

What

[g] Pag. 609—622.

[h] See Ch. xvii. Sect. 2.

What I have to advance on this ſubject, I ſhall deliver in the ten following arguments, the ſix firſt of which are not deciſive; but the four laſt, I think, ſhew beyond a doubt, that St. Paul was really a priſoner in Rome at two different times, and that this Epiſtle was written during the ſecond impriſonment.

1. When St. Paul wrote to the Coloſſians, and ſtill later, when he wrote to the Philippians, Timothy was with him, as appears from Col. i. 1. Phil. i. 1. But Timothy was abſent, and in Aſia Minor, when he received his ſecond Epiſtle from St. Paul.

Now this argument ſhews, that theſe Epiſtles were written at different periods: but it does not determine which of them was written firſt. As far as we can judge from the Acts of the Apoſtles, Timothy did not accompany St. Paul on his voyage from Cæſarea to Italy, nor even on his journey to Jeruſalem, where St. Paul was firſt apprehended: for the name of Timothy does not once occur from the twenty-firſt chapter of the Acts to the end of the book. St. Paul therefore might have written the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy immediately after his arrival in Rome, and have requeſted him to come thither before the winter[1]: conſequently, Timothy came to Rome after the receipt of St. Paul's ſecond Epiſtle to him. On the other hand, St. Paul ſays in his Epiſtle to the Philippians, ch. ii. 19. he hopes ſoon to ſend Timothy to them: whence it follows, that Timothy was abſent from Rome, ſoon after St. Paul wrote to the Philippians. Now if we aſſume only one impriſonment of St. Paul in Rome, it is not impoſſible, that after Timothy's departure, the Apoſtle requeſted him to come again to Rome; but if St. Paul was priſoner there at two different times, we have no ground for the ſuppoſition, that Timothy, who was with St. Paul in the middle of the firſt impriſonment, was again with him at the beginning of the ſecond.

2. When

2. When St. Paul wrote the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, St. Mark was with him, as appears from Coloſſ. iv. 10. Philem. 23.: but St. Mark was abſent from St. Paul, when he wrote the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, as we ſee from ch. iv. 11. where he requeſts Timothy to bring St. Mark with him.

This argument is again indeciſive, and may be applied on the other ſide of the queſtion. St. Mark may very poſſibly have been abſent from Rome in the firſt year of St. Paul's impriſonment, have come thither before the winter, and conſequently have been with St. Paul, when the Apoſtle wrote to the Coloſſians. On the other hand, it is equally poſſible that St. Mark was with St. Paul, at the commencement of the impriſonment: but it muſt not therefore be inferred, that he was there likewiſe at the beginning of the ſecond impriſonment, and conſequently St. Paul, during the ſecond impriſonment, may, by means of Timothy, have requeſted St. Mark to come again to Rome, where he had before been ſo ſerviceable to the Apoſtle.

3. St. Luke, who accompanied St. Paul from Cæſarea to Rome, and remained probably two years there, was with St. Paul, when he wrote the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, as well as, when he wrote the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, as appears from 2 Tim. iv. 11. Col. iv. 14.: but St. Luke was not with him when he wrote the Epiſtle to the Philippians, as I have already ſhewn, Ch. xxi. Sect. 2.

This argument may be likewiſe applied on both ſides of the queſtion. St. Luke, who was his uſual companion, may have been with him at Rome in a ſecond, as well as in the firſt, impriſonment. And, during the two years impriſonment mentioned Acts xxviii. 30, 31. St. Paul's ſituation was far from being ſo dangerous, as it is repreſented in the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy.

4. When St. Paul wrote to the Coloſſians and to Philemon, Demas was with him, as we find in Col. iv. 14. Philem. 24.: but when he wrote the ſecond

Epiſtle

Epiſtle to Timothy, Demas had left him, and was gone to Theſſalonica. This circumſtance makes it probable, that the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written later, than that to the Coloſſians: but it is not deciſive, becauſe it is poſſible, that Demas, though he deſerted St. Paul, might repent and afterwards return to him. The argument however is at leaſt a preſumptive one.

5. It appears from Epheſ. vi. 21, 22. and Col. iv. 7, 8. that St. Paul, when he had written theſe Epiſtles, ſent Tychicus with them to Epheſus, Coloſſæ, and other places in Aſia Minor: and at this very time, Timothy was with St. Paul in Rome. Again, St. Paul in his ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, ch. iv. 22. tells him, that he has ſent Tychicus to Epheſus. Tychicus therefore was ſent by St. Paul from Rome to Epheſus at two different times: and if we conſider the diſtance between the places, and the time requiſite for executing his commiſſion, it is not unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that a year elapſed between his firſt departure from Rome, and his return thither. Hence we may infer, that there was an interval of a year between the writing of the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, and of the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy: but whether the former or the latter was firſt written, ſtill remains a queſtion. Several commentators have applied this argument in ſo confuſed a manner, that it is difficult to determine what inference they intend to draw from it: but Moſheim, whom I have followed, has ſet it in a clearer light.

6. It appears from 2 Tim. iv. 6, 7, 8. that when St. Paul wrote the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, his proſpects were ſo unfavourable, that he expected ſoon to ſuffer martyrdom: but he had the ſtrongeſt expectations of being ſoon releaſed, when he wrote the Epiſtle to the Philippians, as we ſee from Phil. i. 25.

This argument Moſheim[k] conſidered as deciſive in favour of the opinion, that St. Paul was releaſed after he wrote his Epiſtle to the Philippians, and that he wrote

[k] Pag. 615. of his Expoſition of the Epiſtles to Timothy.

wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy during a ſecond impriſonment, only a ſhort time before his death. But, as this argument reſts on the ſuppoſition, that St. Paul had, from inſpiration, ſuch a knowledge of future events, as to be incapable of a miſtake in what he confidently expected, which not every critic of the preſent age will admit; and, as queſtions of hiſtorical fact ought properly to be determined by hiſtorical arguments, or ſuch as men of all deſcriptions muſt admit, I do not reckon the preſent argument among the deciſive ones. Beſides, the expectation of martyrdom, which St. Paul expreſſes, 2 Tim. iv. 6—8. are not couched in ſuch ſtrong terms, as his expectation of releaſe, Phil. i. 25. where he ſays πεποιθως οιδα: and they appear to have been built on no other foundation than the appearance of things, which were liable to change. Further, an Apoſtle may be inſpired by the Deity when he is writing on matters of doctrine and faith: and yet that very Apoſtle may remain as ignorant, as other men, in regard to the good or ill fortune, which awaits himſelf. And, as it would be detrimental to men in general to know with certainty their future deſtiny, we may ſuppoſe, that St. Paul himſelf could judge of his own fate only from preſent probabilities. In his Epiſtle to the Romans, ch. 24, 28. 30—33. he ſpeaks of plans and deſigns, which he intended to put in execution: but as we do not know that they ever were, we muſt not conſider theſe declarations as prophecies.

On the ſix preceding arguments therefore I ſhall lay no particular ſtreſs: but the four following are deciſive, and clearly ſhew, that the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written, not only later than thoſe to the Coloſſians and Philippians, but during a ſecond impriſonment of St. Paul in Rome.

7. Whether the expectations of St. Paul, that he ſhould ſoon ſuffer martyrdom were fulfilled, or not, it is certain, that his ſituation, when he wrote the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, was extremely dangerous. This

appears,

appears, not only from the above-quoted paſſage, ch. iv. 6, 7, 8. but likewiſe from ver. 16. where St. Paul ſays, that at his firſt anſwer all men forſook him. This is quite the reverſe of his ſituation when he wrote to the Philippians: for at that time the gentle treatment of St. Paul had emboldened many to preach the Goſpel, and had induced even ſeveral Jews to teach Chriſtianity, in the hopes of gain[1]. Further, St. Paul ſays, 2 Tim. iv. 17. that though every man deſerted him on his firſt hearing, the Lord ſtood by him, and he was 'delivered from the mouth of the lion.' This ſtrong expreſſion indicates, that St. Paul had been in very great danger. Again, the Apoſtle ſays in the following verſe, he hopes the Lord will deliver him from every evil work, that is, as he himſelf explains it, not in a temporal ſenſe, but 'unto his heavenly kingdom.'

Theſe circumſtances ſhew, not only that the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written at a different time from the Epiſtles to the Coloſſians, to Philemon, and the Philippians, in which he expreſſes his hopes of being ſoon releaſed, and even deſires Philemon to prepare for him a lodging, but determine likewiſe the queſtion, which the preceding arguments left unſettled, whether it was written ſooner or later, and clearly decide in favour of the latter opinion. During the two years, when St. Paul was firſt priſoner in Rome, his confinement and treatment were extremely mild, as St. Luke relates, Acts xxviii. 16—31. ſaying, that St. Paul lived in his own lodging, guarded only by a ſingle ſoldier, and received viſits unmoleſted. This indulgence would not have been granted him, had he been at that time perſecuted in ſuch a manner, as to warrant the ſtrong expreſſion of a deliverance from the mouth of the lion, and an expectation of ſuffering death.

This ſeventh argument therefore clearly ſhews, that the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written at a later period than the two years impriſonment mentioned by St. Luke, during which were written the Epiſtles to the Coloſſians,

[1] Phil. i. 14—17.

Coloſſians, to Philemon, and the Philippians. But this ſeventh argument alone does not decide the queſtion, whether St. Paul was actually releaſed at the end of the two years, and therefore wrote this Epiſtle in a ſecond impriſonment in Rome, or whether he was not releaſed, and therefore wrote it, in the ſame impriſonment continued. As we have no hiſtorical data on this ſubject, it ſtill remains poſſible therefore, that the latter is true, and that at the cloſe of the ſecond year, St. Paul's ſituation was altered materially for the worſe in conſequence of the perſecution, which the Chriſtians underwent in the year 65, after the conflagration of Rome. But the following arguments ſhew, that St. Paul was actually releaſed, and that the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written during a ſecond impriſonment in Rome.

8. It appears from 2 Tim. iv. 13. 20. that, when St. Paul wrote the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, he had lately been in Troas, Miletus, and Corinth. He had therefore taken at that time a very different route to Rome, from that, which St. Luke has deſcribed in the two laſt chapters of the Acts.

In 2 Tim. iv. 13. he deſires Timothy to bring with him a trunk, and eſpecially ſome books, which he had left behind at Troas. But St. Paul, on his voyage from Cæſarea to Italy, deſcribed in the two laſt chapters of the Acts, did not come near Troas, for he ſailed only along the ſouthern coaſt of Aſia Minor. It is true, that he viſited Troas on his way to Jeruſalem, previous to his impriſonment, and his ſubſequent voyage to Italy, as we find from Acts xx. 4, 5, 6, 7. But as this viſit to Troas happened in the year 60, and the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy could not have been written before the year 65, I cannot ſuppoſe that St. Paul then left behind at Troas what he deſired to Timothy to bring, becauſe he would hardly have deferred the ſending for theſe things ſo long as five years. In this caſe, he would rather have ſent for them to Cæſarea, where he continued not leſs than two years in priſon: or, if he

had deſired Timothy to bring them to Rome, he would have made the requeſt on his firſt arrival there.

9. When St. Paul wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, he had lately left Trophimus ſick at Miletus, as appears likewiſe from ch. iv. 20. But this could not have happened on the journey to Jeruſalem, becauſe Trophimus was with St. Paul in Jeruſalem, Acts xxi. 29. And on his voyage from Cæſarea to Italy, St. Paul did not touch at Miletus: conſequently, he could not at that time have left him ſick there, even if Trophimus had accompanied St. Paul on this voyage, of which however we have no knowledge. Lardner indeed aſſerts[m], that Trophimus might have accompanied St. Paul on his voyage, though St. Luke has not mentioned it: and that, as the ſhip, in which St. Paul ſailed, paſſed along the coaſt of Aſia Minor, he might then have ſet Trophimus on ſhore at Miletus. But, if we attend to St. Luke's narrative, we ſhall find this to be utterly impoſſible. For St. Luke ſays, ch. xxvii. 8. 'When we had ſailed ſlowly many days, and ſcarce were come over againſt Cnidus, the wind not ſuffering us, we ſailed under Crete, over againſt Salmone.' The wind therefore was north, and Cnidus was the moſt northerly place, which they could reach: conſequently, they could not have reached Miletus, which lay two-thirds of a degree ſtill more to the north. Beza and Grotius have endeavoured to remove this objection, which is a ſtrong argument againſt their hypotheſis, by propoſing to read εν Μελιτη, 2 Tim. iv. 20. inſtead of εν Μιλητω: and Lardner likewiſe has no objection to this alteration. But as it is ſupported by no Greek manuſcript, and no ancient verſion, and is adopted with no other view, than to ſtrengthen a previouſly aſſumed opinion, it is certainly not admiſſible.

Other commentators have endeavoured to free themſelves from this difficulty by ſaying, that St. Paul's aſſertion,

[m] Supplement to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, Vol. II. p. 237—239

aſſertion, '"I have left Trophimus ſick at Miletus,' means only, 'I have put Trophimus ſick on ſhore, that he might go to Miletus.' But this is a forced and unnatural explanation: for if St. Paul had ſet Trophimus on ſhore at any other place than Miletus, he would have mentioned that place, and not the place, where, according to this explanation, he really did not leave him. Beſides, if Trophimus was ſick, it would have been as fatiguing to have travelled to Miletus from the place, where he landed, as to have remained in the ſhip: and, if he was able to travel, he would have gone not to Miletus, but to Epheſus, for Trophimus was an Epheſian. This therefore is a mere evaſion, which has no other object, than to prove at any rate, let the difficulties be what they will, that the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written during St. Paul's firſt impriſonment in Rome.

10. St. Paul ſays, ch. iv. 20. that Eraſtus ſtaid behind in Corinth. Conſequently, St. Paul muſt have paſſed through Corinth on that journey to Rome, after which he wrote the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy. But when he went from Cæſarea to Italy, it is evident from St. Luke's narrative, Acts xxvii. xxviii. that he could not have paſſed through Corinth.

To this important argument Lardner has endeavoured to anſwer, by ſaying[n], that Eraſtus ſtaid behind at Corinth, when St. Paul left that city to go to Jeruſalem. But at that time Timothy left Corinth in company with St. Paul, and therefore ſtood in no need of information in reſpect to what Eraſtus then did. This Lardner admits: but he anſwers, though very unſatisfactorily, that the Apoſtle reminded Timothy of this circumſtance, in order to ſhew him that his preſence was ſo much the more neceſſary. Further, Lardner's argument in favour of the opinion, that Eraſtus was actually at Corinth, when St. Paul left that city to go to Jeruſalem, is very inſufficient. Eraſtus, he ſays, was ſent by St. Paul from Epheſus into Macedonia, Acts xix. 22.

Soon

[n] Pag. 235.

Soon after, St. Paul himſelf went into Macedonia: and when he returned into Aſia Minor, Eraſtus did not return with him, for his name is not mentioned among St. Paul's attendants, Acts xx. 4. Now, if from theſe premiſes we may draw any inference, it can be no other than this, that Eraſtus ſtaid behind in Macedonia: but Lardner infers, that Eraſtus ſtaid behind in Corinth.

The preceding arguments, I think, clearly ſhew, that the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written during a ſecond impriſonment of St. Paul in Rome. With reſpect to the more minute circumſtances of the time, it appears to have been written about the month of July, or at the lateſt in the month of Auguſt; for St. Paul requeſts Timothy, who was then in Aſia Minor, to come to him before the winter, and the Epiſtle was probably a month on its paſſage. The year, in which it was written, I would rather ſuppoſe to be 66 than 65. For in the beginning of the year 65 St. Paul was releaſed from his firſt impriſonment: and between his releaſe and his ſecond impriſonment he had taken a very long journey, having viſited Corinth, Troas, Miletus, and, ſince it was his intention to do ſo, probably likewiſe Philippi and Coloſſæ. When St. Paul returned to Rome after this journey, and became again a priſoner, he found the ſituation of affairs totally changed, which it is very eaſy to conceive, and the conflagration of Rome, and the ſubſequent perſecution of the Chriſtians happened in the latter half of the year 65. St. Paul however could not have been in Rome during the violence of the perſecution, neither as priſoner, nor as free: for the proceſs againſt him would then have been much ſhorter[o], than that which he deſcribes in the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy. Nor would Demas, Creſcens, Titus, and Tychicus, whom St. Paul mentions, ch. iv. 10, 12, as having left Rome, have been ſuffered to depart unmoleſted. But if we ſuppoſe, that the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written in

[o] Correpti qui fatebantur, ſays Tacitus.

in the ſummer of the year 66, we may explain various phænomena in this Epiſtle. The violence of the perſecution had then ſubſided, yet the fear of a renewal of it prevented St. Paul's former friends from taking his part in public. Hence he ſays, ch. iv. 16. that at his firſt anſwer, no one ventured to ſtand with him; but he adds, ver. 17. that he was delivered for that time out of the 'mouth of the lion.' From this expreſſion we may conclude, that the danger, which St. Paul apprehended, was not that of ſuffering death by the ſword, but that of being expoſed to wild beaſts in a Roman amphitheatre, as ſeveral Chriſtians had already been, and that in a very cruel manner[p]. As ſentence was not paſſed on his firſt hearing, a nondum liquet, according to the forms of the Roman law, muſt have been declared, and his proſecutors directed to continue the ſuit. An opportunity therefore was offered him of making a ſecond defence; and, as the games of the amphitheatre were then over, he might conclude, that he would ſurvive the following winter[q]. The ſalutations, which St. Paul ſends in this Epiſtle, are from perſons, whoſe names he had not mentioned before: and he is totally ſilent on Clement, and on other Perſons, whoſe names we ſhould expect to find in this Epiſtle. Perhaps they had already ſuffered martyrdom, or, if not, had fled from Rome.

[p] Pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis contecti laniatu earum interirent. Tacit. Annal. xv. 44.

[q] On this ſubject the reader may conſult Cicero, Proœmium Act. I. in Verrem cap. 10. and recollect that the prolongation of the charge and defence might make it neceſſary to wait for evidence from diſtant parts.

SECT. III.

Contents of this Epiſtle.

THIS Epiſtle contains, for the moſt part, advice to Timothy to oppoſe with all his power the falſe teachers, and to propagate the Goſpel. As falſe teachers, Hymenæus and Philetus are particularly mentioned, ch. ii. 17, 18. of whom St. Paul ſays, 'Who, concerning the truth, have erred, ſaying, that the reſurrection is paſt already.' What they meant, in ſaying, 'that the reſurrection is paſt already,' it is difficult exactly to determine. But it is highly probable, that they acted in the ſame manner, as many perſons in the preſent age, who endeavour to alter the doctrines of Chriſtianity. They denied the reſurrection of the body at the day of judgement as taught by St. Paul: but they ſtill retained the term 'reſurrection,' that the oppoſition might not be too glaring, and aſcribed to it ſuch a meaning, as they thought proper. They were unwilling to forfeit their title as Chriſtians, and therefore would not ſay in poſitive terms, that there was no ſuch thing as a reſurrection, becauſe Chriſt himſelf had ſpoken of it. Yet they denied the fact in their hearts, becauſe it was not to be reconciled with their philoſophy. In this reſpect, they argued differently from modern ſceptics, who refuſe their aſſent to the doctrine of a reſurrection of the body, becauſe they think that the proofs of it are not ſufficiently ſtrong to procure conviction; and who aſſert, not ſo much that the doctrine is abſolutely falſe, as that no one can prove it to be true. But the ſceptics in the time of St. Paul attempted to bring a poſitive proof of its falſhood: and arguing on the principles of the oriental philoſophy, which derived all ſin from matter, they contended, that the pure and ſpiritual ſoul, when once delivered from its body or earthly impriſonment, would, inſtead

of

of deriving any advantage, materially ſuffer from being again attached to it.

Perhaps, Hymenæus and Philetus, who retained the name of 'reſurrection,' though they in fact denied the thing, aſcribed to it a figurative meaning, and made it equivalent to 'regeneration:' for in this ſenſe they might truly ſay of every good Chriſtian, that reſurrection had already taken place. Or, as the doctrine of tranſmigration of ſouls was at that time not uncommon, they might have taken the word 'reſurrection' in this ſenſe, and ſay, that a reſurrection took place, as often as a child was born.

As this Epiſtle was written to St. Paul's moſt intimate friend, and was not deſigned for the uſe of others, it may ſerve to exhibit to us the temper and character of St. Paul, and to convince us, that he was no deceiver, but that he ſincerely believed the doctrines, which he preached. This ſubject however, as it is of ſome importance, I ſhall examine at large in the following chapter.

CHAP. XXIII.

OF ST. PAUL'S CHARACTER AND MODE OF LIFE.

SECT. I.

Whether St. Paul was an impoſtor, an enthuſiaſt, or a meſſenger from heaven.

AS St. Paul was not a diſciple of Chriſt during his miniſtry, and as many Jewiſh zealots and other heretics were offended at his doctrine, his right to the name and dignity of an Apoſtle of Chriſt was diſputed by many, eſpecially in Galatia, and at Corinth. And

though he triumphed over his enemies, and ſilenced them during his life, yet ſome later heretics have refuſed to acknowledge him as a meſſenger from Chriſt. But his divine miſſion is ſufficiently proved by his miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt. I have not room to enlarge, as I could wiſh, on this ſubject: but I will take notice of the principal objections, which in modern times have been made to St. Paul's divine miſſion. That he wilfully and maliciouſly impoſed upon the world is an aſſertion almoſt too abſurd to be made: for it is impoſſible to conceive what advantage he could have propoſed to himſelf from the impoſture. He ſubſiſted by the labour of his own hands; he loſt his credit among the Jews by preaching the Goſpel; he involved himſelf in troubles and diſgrace; and was at laſt obliged to ſeal his doctrine with his blood. If we conſider further the undiſſembled calmneſs of mind, conſpicuous throughout the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, at a time when his death was impending, he cannot poſſibly be taken for a wicked deceiver, who was diſappointed in his hope. According to Epiphanius[1], the Ebionites propagated the following ridiculous ſtory. St. Paul, they ſaid, who acknowledged himſelf to be a native of Tarſus, was born a heathen: but that on coming to Jeruſalem he was captivated with the daughter of a Jewiſh high prieſt[2], and in order to obtain her in marriage underwent the rite of circumciſion. His expectations however, they ſay, were diſappointed, and on that account St. Paul became ſuch an enemy to the Jewiſh religion, that he reſolved to preach Chriſtianity as the ſureſt means of undermining it. This ſtory is ſo abſurd, that it carries with it its own confutation.

Others pretend, that St. Paul was an enthuſiaſt, and that he was not ſo much an intentional deceiver of others, as one, who was himſelf deceived. It is ſaid, that

[1] Hæreſ. XXX. § 16.

[2] The name of the high prieſt is very prudently not mentioned.

that the appearance of Chriſt to St. Paul on his journey to Damaſcus was merely an imaginary viſion, and the reſult of St. Paul's heated imagination: that it was merely thunder, which he took for the voice of Chriſt, and which he fancied to be a call from Heaven: and that his own gift of miracles, as well as his power of imparting it to others, was wholly ideal. The common anſwer to this objection is, that his former zeal for the law and againſt Chriſt rendered it impoſſible for him to perſuade himſelf falſely that Chriſt had appeared to him, and called him to be an Apoſtle. But this anſwer is not ſatisfactory: for enthuſiaſts always run into extremes, and are very apt in certain circumſtances to imagine things directly oppoſite to their former ſentiments. I would propoſe therefore the following queſtions.

1. If the appearance of Chriſt to St. Paul, related in the ninth chapter of the Acts, was a mere imaginary viſion, and only a phantom which preſented itſelf to St. Paul's agitated mind, what is the reaſon that his companions likewiſe ſaw and heard any part of what paſſed?

2. How could St. Paul imagine to the end of his days, that he wrought certain miracles, which were never wrought? Were not his ſenſes evidences to him of the contrary? How could he imagine, that he communicated to others the gift of tongues, if they did not ſpeak languages, with which they were before unacquainted? Was St. Paul himſelf, were the Chriſtian communities, to which he wrote, were his fellow-labourers, ſo deprived both of their ſight and hearing, as to imagine theſe things, if they had never happened? The prophets of the Cevennes in the preſent century were the greateſt enthuſiaſts in the world: yet they did not imagine the contrary of what they ſaw and heard. And though they were ſanguine in propheſying, that they ſhould raiſe the dead, they never ventured to make the experiment. But St. Paul, it is pretended, perſuaded himſelf almoſt twenty ſucceſſive years, that he was working what he

did not work; and that many thouſands joined with him in believing the contrary of what they ſaw. Is this poſſible?

3. What enthuſiaſt, or fanatic, ever ventured upon morals, without being miſled by his imagination to invent an extravagant ſyſtem? Whereas in the morality taught by St. Paul we meet with nothing, but what is rational, and conſiſtent with philoſophical ethics.

4. When a man of frantic and diſordered brain ſuffers the heat of his imagination to carry him ſo far, as to ſeal his error by his death, his reſolution is generally accompanied with a wild irrational vehemence and deſpair. The joyfulneſs of the martyrs in the ſecond and third centuries, and the eagerneſs, with which they plunged into ſufferings, frequently bordered on this kind of phrenſy. But, when St. Paul ſaw death approaching, his temper of mind was calm and rational. He went with fortitude, to meet death, but he did not ſeek it: on the contrary he defended himſelf, as well as he was able, and felt the uſual and natural apprehenſions of a man, who expects to forfeit his life.

Laſtly, ſome have contended that St. Paul was not an enthuſiaſt, but a cool and deliberate free-thinker, whoſe object was to deliver, by a well-intended fraud, both the world in general, and the Jews in particular, from the yoke of ſuperſtition. But to this objection I ſhall not reply at preſent, becauſe it belongs rather to deiſtical controverſy, than to an Introduction to the New Teſtament.

SECT. II.

Of St. Paul's profeſſion, or trade.

ST. PAUL frequently ſays in his Epiſtles, that he received no pay from the Chriſtian communities, except from that of Philippi, and that he earned his bread by the labour of his own hands: though at the ſame time he declares, that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and that the teacher deſerves to be recompenſed by thoſe who are taught. He even ordained, that other teachers ſhould be paid by the churches, and excluded only himſelf from a participation of the pay [t]. He ſays in expreſs terms to the elders of the church at Epheſus, where he had reſided three years, 'I have coveted no man's ſilver, or gold, or apparel; yea, ye yourſelves know, that theſe hands have miniſtered unto my neceſſities, and to them, that were with me [u].' Now St. Paul had generally ſeveral aſſiſtants with him: and, when he was at Epheſus, he by no means lived in a narrow or ſparing manner. For he hired a public auditory, where he daily taught the doctrines of Chriſtianity [w], and where every one was permitted to enter without fee or reward. And among his Epheſian friends he reckoned ſeveral Aſiarchs, who were opulent annual magiſtrates, and who were certainly not Chriſtians, as it was their office, eſpecially of one of their body, to preſide over the religious games, of which the preſident defrayed the greateſt part of the expence [x]. Nor does St. Paul appear to have been in narrow circumſtances during his two years impriſonment at Cæſarea: for the

[t] See 1 Cor. ix. 2 Cor. xi. 7—11. Gal. vi. 6—10. Phil. iv. 10—16. 1 Tim. v. 17, 18.

[u] Acts xx. 33, 34.

[w] Acts xix. 9.

[x] See Boze's Eſſay on this ſubject, in the 17th volume of the Memoires de l' Academie des Inſcriptions et Belles Lettres.

the Roman governor, Felix, frequently ſent for him and converſed with him, expecting that money would be offered for his releaſe.

That among the Jews, even men of learning, (as St. Paul certainly was, who had been educated under Gamaliel), gained their livelihood by the labour of their own hands, is a matter which is well known. But the queſtion is, by what kind of labour was St. Paul, who devoted ſo much time to the exerciſe of his Apoſtolical office, enabled to provide ſo plentifully both for himſelf and his companions. The Greek term uſed by St. Luke, Acts xviii. 3. where he ſays that St. Paul and Aquilas exerciſed the ſame art, is σκηνοποιος. This word, which does not occur in other Greek authors, is ſuppoſed to be equivalent to σκηνορραφος, and is taken by ſome commentators to denote a worker in leather, either a ſaddler, or a maker of leather chairs which were ſtrapped on the back of a camel [y]. But no man can exerciſe the trade of a ſaddler, who leads ſuch a wandering life, as St. Paul did: for a ſaddler has ſo many materials neceſſary for his buſineſs, that they cannot conveniently be tranſported from town to town. Whoever therefore reads with attention the ſixteenth and ſeventeenth chapters of the Acts of the Apoſtles, and obſerves how ſhort a ſtay St. Paul made in each place, and how frequently he was forced to depart ſuddenly, muſt perceive that the notion of St. Paul's being a travelling ſaddler is wholly abſurd. Beſides, the very employment of a ſaddler is by no means calculated for a travelling trade; for ſince ſaddlers in every town have generally their fixed cuſtomers, a man of this trade, who came a ſtranger to any place, might wait there a twelvemonth, before he found employment. And even if this objection were removed, it is ſtill difficult to comprehend, how any man who devoted the greateſt part of his time to ſpiritual purpoſes, and had only a few hours leiſure every day for the labour of his hands,

[y] See my edition of Caſtelli Lexicon Syriacum, p. 454. under the article ܠܘܠܕܐ: and I. Helfrich's Short account of a journey to Jeruſalem in 1581, under the date, 11 October.

hands, could earn enough as a ſaddler to ſupply, in an ample manner, the neceſſities both of himſelf, and of his friends. If we explain σκηνοποιος as denoting 'a maker of leather chairs to be ſtrapped on the backs of camels,' the difficulty will be ſtill increaſed; for St. Paul was very frequently in places, where there were no camels, and conſequently where no ſuch chairs were wanted. Other commentators take σκηνοποιος in the ſenſe of a 'tent-maker;' but the ſame objections, which I have made to the other applications of the word, may be made likewiſe to this. And if Aquilas, who was of the ſame trade with St. Paul, was a tent-maker, it muſt ſeem extraordinary, that a man, who was a native of Pontus, in the neighbourhood of which country there were nations who lived in tents, ſhould come to Corinth and Epheſus, where tents were not wanted.

But the preceding difficulties are entirely removed by the following paſſage in Julius Pollux, from which it appears that σκηνοποιος has properly a very different meaning from either of thoſe already mentioned. This learned writer ſays in his Onomaſticon, Lib. VII. § 189. that σκηνοποιος in the language of the old comedy was equivalent to μηχανοποιος [z]. Now μηχανοποιος ſignifies a 'maker of mechanical inſtruments.' Conſequently St. Paul and Aquilas were neither ſaddlers, nor tent-makers, but mechanical inſtrument makers. And this profeſſion ſuited extremely well their mode of life: for, whoever poſſeſſes ability in the art can earn, in a *few* hours every day, as much as is neceſſary for his ſupport, and can eaſily travel from place to place, becauſe the apparatus is eaſily tranſported. It is therefore extraordinary that no commentator has hitherto taken σκηνοποιὸς, Acts xviii. 3. in this ſenſe: and ſtill more extraordinary that Julius Pollux has been actually quoted for a very different purpoſe,

[z] Τὸς δὲ μηχανοποιὸς καὶ σκηνοποιὸς ἡ παλαια κωμῳδια ωνομαζε. Though Julius Pollux ſays that σκηνοποιος was thus uſed in the old comedy, and does not quote any living authors, yet it muſt be obſerved that the words uſed in comedy are the words of common converſation, though not always uſed by authors.

purpoſe, namely, to caution the reader againſt aſcribing to σκηνοποιος, Acts xviii. 3. the ſenſe, which is given it in the Onomaſticon of Julius Pollux. Such commentators moſt ſurely have never reflected on the advantages, which attend this ſenſe, and the difficulties, which attend the others.

CHAP. XXIV.

OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

SECT. I.

General remarks: and ſtatement of the queſtions to be examined in this chapter.

I HAVE deferred to this place the examination of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, becauſe it is a matter of diſpute, which perhaps will never be finally determined, whether it was written by St. Paul, or not. In the preceding editions of this Introduction, I wholly neglected to treat of this Epiſtle, and contented myſelf with referring the reader to other authors: though, when I publiſhed the third edition I had already written a particular Expoſition of this Epiſtle, which I quoted as well as Lardner's Supplement to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory [a]. But, ſince an Introduction to the New Teſtament ought to contain a diſſertation on every part of it, I think it neceſſary to ſupply, in the preſent, the deficiency of the preceding editions. And I am the more ſtrongly urged to the undertaking, firſt, as I have lately made ſeveral obſervations on this ſubject, which had formerly eſcaped my notice, as well as the notice of

[a] Vol. II. Ch. 12.

of other commentators, and ſecondly, as I entertain at preſent much ſtronger doubts, both as to the author of this Epiſtle, and its canonical authority, than Lardner, to whom I referred the reader in the laſt edition. I ſhall have frequent occaſion, in the courſe of this chapter, to quote my Diſſertation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews prefixed to the Expoſition of this Epiſtle: and it muſt be obſerved, that I always mean the new and improved edition, publiſhed in 1780.

The queſtions to be examined in the ſeveral ſections of this chapter are the following.

1. Is that, which we call the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, really an Epiſtle?
2. Is it quoted by St. Peter?
3. If it is an Epiſtle, to what community was it ſent?
4. What was the ſituation of this community?
5. At what time was it written?
6. In what language was it written?
7. If it was written in Hebrew, by whom was it tranſlated into Greek?
8. What is the character of its Greek ſtyle?
9. Who was the author of this Epiſtle?
10. Is it canonical?
11. What are its contents?

SECT. II.

Is that, which we call the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, an Epiſtle, or a Diſſertation? And, if it is an Epiſtle, what is the reaſon, that the initiatory formule is wanting?

AS the initiatory formule, uſual in Greek Epiſtles, is wanting in that which we call the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, the queſtion occurs, notwithſtanding the ſuperſcription

ſuperſcription ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολή, whether it was really an Epiſtle ſent to a particular community or communities, or only a Diſſertation intended for general readers, eſpecially as many topics are diſcuſſed in it in the ſame diffuſive manner, as in a work which the author propoſed to lay before the public. But there are ſeveral arguments, which decide in favour of the former, and ſhew that it was really an Epiſtle addreſſed to particular perſons. For not only the ſecond perſon plural 'ye' inceſſantly occurs in it, which alone indeed would be no proof, but likewiſe we find ſpecial circumſtances, to which the author alludes, ch. v. 11, 12. vi. 9, 10. x. 32—34. and above all, ch. xiii. 23, 24. which contains the promiſe of a viſit, and ſalutations.

The next queſtion therefore to be aſked is: ſince this is an Epiſtle, what is the reaſon, that the initiatory formule is wanting. Several ancient writers, who have undertaken to anſwer this queſtion, pre-ſuppoſe, what is far from being certain, that St. Paul was the author of it, and on this ſuppoſition they ground their anſwers. For inſtance, Clement of Alexandria ſays, that the name of Paul was odious to the Hebrews, and that for this reaſon the Apoſtle did not mention his name at the beginning of it, as in his other Epiſtles, that the Hebrews might not be prejudiced againſt it[b]. Jerom is of the ſame opinion with Clement, for in his Treatiſe of illuſtrious men, he ſays 'propter invidiam ſui nominis titulum amputavit:' and this aſſertion is related by commentators to this very day. But this explanation is ſo very extraordinary, that it appears to me unaccountable, how it could occur to ſuch men, as Clement and Jerom. For at the very ſame time, that it aſcribes to St. Paul the greateſt caution, it aſcribes to him the greateſt ſimplicity. The author of this Epiſtle ſays, ch. xiii. 18, 19. 'Pray for us, for we truſt we have a good conſcience, in all things willing to live honeſtly. But I beſeech you the rather to do this, that I may be reſtored to you the ſooner.' And ver. 23. 'Know ye that our brother Timothy

[b] Euſebii Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Lib. VI. cap. 16.

Timothy is ſet at liberty, with whom, if he come ſhortly, I will ſee you.' Surely no man of common ſenſe would cloſe an Epiſtle in this manner, if he intended that no one ſhould know from whom it came.

In another place, namely, in his Expoſition of the Epiſtle to the Galatians[c], Jerom ſuppoſes, that St. Paul did not mention his name at the beginning of this Epiſtle, becauſe he was unwilling to name himſelf Apoſtle in an Epiſtle, in which this title is given to Chriſt, through fear of placing himſelf on an equality with Chriſt. On the other hand, Theodoret ſays, that St. Paul did not commence the Epiſtle to the Hebrews with the formule, 'Paul an Apoſtle, &c.' becauſe he was the Apoſtle, not of the Hebrews, but of the Gentiles. But neither of theſe reaſons is in the leaſt ſatisfactory: for they account merely for the omiſſion of the word 'Apoſtle,' and not of the name of the author. And if St. Paul was really its author, and was yet unwilling to aſſume in this Epiſtle the title of Apoſtle, he might have mentioned his name without this title, ſince he has actually done it in four other Epiſtles.

The real reaſon, why the initiatory formule, uſual in ancient Epiſtles, is wanting in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, is at preſent therefore not eaſy to be aſſigned, ſince we are entirely deſtitute of hiſtorical information on this ſubject. But as others have ventured to conjecture, the ſame liberty may be granted likewiſe to me. As the Greek Epiſtle to the Hebrews is only a tranſlation, an initiatory formule might have been uſed in the original, but omitted by the tranſlator, either becauſe he thought the name of the author of no great importance[d], or becauſe he was apprehenſive that the name of the author might prejudice Greek readers againſt the Epiſtle, which, as being a very valuable and inſtructive work, he wiſhed to put into their hands. If either of theſe motives operated, St. Paul could not have been the author.

[c] Tom. IV. p. 225.

[d] If this was the motive the tranſlator certainly erred.

SECT. III.

Is the Epiſtle to the Hebrews quoted 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16?

ST. PETER in his ſecond Epiſtle, ch. iii. 15, 16. ſays, 'And account that the long ſuffering of our Lord is our ſalvation: even as our beloved brother Paul alſo, according to the wiſdom given unto him, hath written unto you, as alſo in all his Epiſtles, in which are ſome things hard to be underſtood.' In this paſſage it has been very generally ſuppoſed, eſpecially in modern times, that St. Peter by the words, 'as our beloved brother Paul hath written unto you,' meant the Epiſtle to the Hebrews: and hence the inference has been drawn, not only that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was ſent to the ſame communities, as the ſecond Epiſtle of Peter, namely to thoſe in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Aſia, and Bithynia, but likewiſe that St. Paul was the author of it. Now they who argue in this manner manifeſtly argue in a circle: for, as St. Peter ſpeaks in expreſs terms of an Epiſtle written by St. Paul, we cannot apply the paſſage to the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, without previouſly aſſuming that St. Paul was the author of it. But this is the thing to be proved.

Further, if it could be proved even to a demonſtration, that St. Paul was the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, yet as he was the author of ſo many other Epiſtles, we cannot conclude, that St. Peter meant the Epiſtle to the Hebrews in particular, unleſs it can be ſhewn, that the ſubject, for which St. Peter quotes St. Paul, is diſcuſſed in this Epiſtle. But this is ſo far from being true, that of the matter, on which St. Peter diſcourſes in the place, where he makes the quotation, not a ſyllable is to be found in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. For St. Peter does not ſpeak in this place, as many imagine, of the juſtification of a ſinner before God for the ſake of Chriſt, a ſubject which is certainly diſcuſſed

in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews: but on the contrary, he treats of a very different matter. The words, 'account that the long ſuffering of our Lord is our ſalvation,' (την τ κυριε ημων μακροθυμιαν σωτηριαν ηγεισθε), are explained by what St. Peter had ſaid, ver. 9. 'The Lord is not ſlack concerning his promiſe, as ſome men count ſlackneſs, but is long ſuffering to us-ward, not willing that any ſhould periſh, but that all ſhould come to repentance.' It is evident therefore that St. Peter ſpeaks, not of juſtification through Chriſt, but of the prolongation of the day of judgement, on which many Chriſtians in the firſt century entertained very extraordinary notions. For they imagined, that, according to Chriſt's prophecy, it would take place in the age, in which they lived: and finding that it did not take place, they began to doubt of the truth of the Chriſtian religion. Hence St. Peter aſſures them that 'one day is with the Lord as a thouſand years, and a thouſand years as one day:' that they ought neither to be impatient nor incredulous, becauſe the day of judgement was poſtponed, ſince this very prolongation afforded them an opportunity of repenting, and might be regarded therefore as the means of their ſalvation. On this ſubject not a ſyllable is to be found in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. On the contrary, we find in it aſſurances of the coming of the Lord, which they, to whom the Epiſtle was written, would ſurvive: not indeed to judge the world, but to judge Jeruſalem [c].

Other commentators, who acknowledge that St. Peter in the paſſage in queſtion is ſpeaking of the day of judgement, appeal to Heb. xii. 25—29. where the ſubject likewiſe relates to the general judgement and the end of the world. But this argument is likewiſe inſufficient; for though, in this paſſage of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, as well as in 2 Pet. iii. 15. the ſubject relates to the day of judgement, yet the modes of reaſoning on it in the two paſſages are very different. St. Peter ſpeaks of the prolongation of the day of judgement, and argues from it to the mercy and long ſuffering of God: but we find

[c] Heb. x. 25. 35, 36, 37.

find nothing of this kind in Heb. xii. 25—29. Beſides, St. Peter adds in the paſſage in queſtion, 'as alſo in all his Epiſtles;' the ſubject therefore, which he diſcuſſes, muſt not be conſidered as particularly diſtinguiſhing any one of St. Paul's Epiſtles from the reſt. The clauſe 'in which are ſome things hard to be underſtood' has likewiſe been applied in proof of the opinion, that St. Peter meant the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, becauſe this is a difficult and obſcure Epiſtle. But, not to mention that the Epiſtles to the Romans, the Corinthians, the Epheſians, and the Coloſſians, are equally difficult, St. Peter did not make this aſſertion of any of St. Paul's Epiſtles in particular. The two clauſes in connexion are, 'As alſo in all his Epiſtles, ſpeaking in them of theſe things, in which are ſome things hard to be underſtood.' Here the relative 'which,' if it refers to 'Epiſtles,' according to the reading of many Greek manuſcripts, which have εν αις, refers to St. Paul's Epiſtles in general: and if it refers to 'things' according to the reading of other Greek manuſcripts, which have εν οις, it has no reference whatever to St. Paul's Epiſtles[f]. Beſides, the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter was not written to Hebrews, or circumciſed Jews, but to uncircumciſed Jewiſh proſelytes, as will be ſhewn in a ſubſequent chapter: and therefore by the expreſſion 'as our beloved brother Paul hath written unto you' St. Peter muſt have meant a different Epiſtle from the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

[f] See my Diſſertation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, § 3, 4.

SECT. IV.

The Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written for the uſe of the Chriſtians in Jeruſalem and Paleſtine.

AMONG the various opinions relative to the community or communities, to which this Epiſtle was ſent, the moſt ancient is, that it was deſigned for the uſe of the Jewiſh converts, either at Jeruſalem, or in Paleſtine at large. And this opinion I ſhall adopt as preferable to every other, without entering into the minute diſcuſſion of the queſtion, whether it was ſent to Jeruſalem alone, or to other cities in Paleſtine: for this is a queſtion of little or no importance, ſince an Epiſtle, intended for the uſe of Jewiſh converts in Jeruſalem, muſt have equally concerned the other Jewiſh converts in that country.

It is true, that there is no initiatory formule in this Epiſtle, which perhaps was omitted through the negligence of the tranſlator: and therefore in the Epiſtle itſelf there is no title, to which we can appeal. But the ſuperſcription in all the manuſcripts is Ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολή: and the ſuperſcriptions to the ſeveral Epiſtles of the Apoſtles have hitherto remained free from that ſuſpicion of ſpuriouſneſs, to which the ſubſcriptions are very juſtly expoſed. Now in the language of the New Teſtament, the Hebrews are Jews, who uſed the Hebrew language, and the term is uſed to diſtinguiſh them from thoſe who ſpake Greek, and were called Helleniſts[g]: But Hebrew-ſpeaking Jews, to whom this Epiſtle was addreſſed, cannot well be any other than the Jews of Paleſtine. It is true, that the Jews, who were ſcattered through the Parthian Empire, likewiſe ſpake Hebrew, or more properly, Chaldee: but as no man can ſuppoſe, that this Epiſtle was ſent to perſons, who lived beyond the Euphrates, it would be a waſte of time, to ſhew that the

[g] Compare Acts vi. 1. with my Diſſertation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, § 8.

the word 'Hebrews' does not denote the Parthian Jews[h]. That the Epiſtle was written to Hebrews, is agreed on by all antiquity. Clement of Alexandria ſays that it was written for the Hebrews in the Hebrew language[i]: on which words no other meaning can be put, as far as I am able to judge, than that it was written in Hebrew, for the benefit of thoſe, whoſe native language was Hebrew. And in this manner I underſtand all the ancient writers, who ſay that the Epiſtle was written in Hebrew. But where are we to ſeek for Hebrew-ſpeaking Jews, to whom this Epiſtle could be ſent, except in Paleſtine? This queſtion I will not anſwer decidedly in the affirmative, as an indubitable hiſtorical fact, but only as a probable opinion, eſpecially ſince Chryſoſtom delivers it only as ſuch. For he ſays in his Preface or Hypotheſis to his Expoſition of this Epiſtle, 'Why did he write to the Jews, whoſe teacher he was not: And where were they to whom he wrote?' 'In my opinion at Jeruſalem, and in Paleſtine[k].'

This moſt ancient opinion or report is corroborated by the contents of the Epiſtle itſelf. In other Epiſtles, which were addreſſed to mixed communities, we meet with frequent exhortations to brotherly love and unity between the converts from Judaiſm and Heatheniſm, who are repreſented as equals, and as brethren: but in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews are no ſuch exhortations, which agrees with the hypotheſis, that it was ſent to Chriſtian communities in Paleſtine, becauſe theſe were not mixed communities, but conſiſted wholly of Jewiſh converts. It is true that the author ſpeaks of brotherly love,

[h] I will obſerve however, that if this Epiſtle had been ſent to Parthian Jews, who became converts to Chriſtianity, the Hebrew original would hardly have been loſt; for in the countries, which bordered on the Euphrates, the Chriſtian religion was propagated at a very early age. And in this caſe likewiſe, the author of the Syriac verſion would have tranſlated this Epiſtle, not from the Greek, but from the Hebrew.

[i] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. VI. cap. 14. Την προς Εβραιους επιστολην Παυλε μεν ειναι φησι, γεγραφθαι δε Εβραιοις Εβραικη φωνη.

[k] Τινος ην ενεκεν, ουκ ων των Ιουδαιων διδασκαλος, επιστελλει αυτοις; που δε ην επιστελλειν; Εμοι δοκει, εν Ιερουσολυμοις και Παλαιστινη.

love, ch. xiii. 1. where he ſays, 'Let brotherly love continue.' But he ſpeaks here only in general terms, and ſays nothing of unity between Jewiſh and Heathen converts in particular. Beſides, as the author uſes the word 'continue,' we may conclude that in the community, to which he was writing, no diſunion had actually taken place among its members.

Another argument, derived from the contents of the Epiſtle, in favour of the opinion, that it was written for the Chriſtians in Paleſtine, is, as appears from the whole tenor of it, that the perſons, to whom it was addreſſed, were in imminent danger of falling back from Chriſtianity to Judaiſm, induced partly by a ſevere perſecution, and partly by the falſe arguments of the Rabbins. This could hardly have happened to ſeveral communities at the ſame time, in any other country than Paleſtine, and therefore we cannot ſuppoſe it of ſeveral communities of Aſia Minor, to which, in the opinion of ſome commentators, the Epiſtle was addreſſed. Chriſtianity, as Lardner has obſerved in the firſt book of his Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, ch. viii., and as plainly appears from the Acts of the Apoſtles, enjoyed from the tolerating ſpirit of the Roman laws and the Roman magiſtrates, throughout the Empire in general, ſo much religious liberty, that out of Paleſtine it would have been difficult to have effected a general perſecution. But, through the influence of the Jewiſh Sanhedrim in Jeruſalem, the Chriſtians in that country underwent ſeveral ſevere perſecutions, eſpecially during the High-prieſthood of the younger Ananus, when St. James and other Chriſtians ſuffered martyrdom. Further, if we examine the Epiſtles of St. Paul, eſpecially thoſe to the Epheſians, Philippians, and Coloſſians, with the two Epiſtles of St. Peter, which were addreſſed to the Chriſtians in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Aſia, and Bithynia, we ſhall find, though mention is made of ſeducers, not the ſmalleſt traces of imminent danger of an apoſtacy to Judaiſm, and ſtill leſs of blaſphemy againſt Chriſt, as we find in the ſixth and tenth chapters of the

Epiſtle to the Hebrews. The two paſſages of this Epiſtle, ch. vi. 6. x. 29. which relate to blaſphemy againſt Chriſt, as a perſon juſtly condemned and crucified, are peculiarly adapted to the ſituation of communities in Paleſtine; and it is difficult to read theſe paſſages without inferring that ſeveral Chriſtians had really apoſtatized and openly blaſphemed Chriſt: for it appears from Acts xxvi. 11. that violent meaſures were taken in Paleſtine for this very purpoſe, of which we meet with no traces in any other country at that early age. Neither the Epiſtles of St. Paul, nor thoſe of St. Peter, furniſh any inſtance of a public renunciation of Chriſtianity and return to Judaiſm: and yet, if any ſuch inſtances had happened in the communities, to which they wrote, theſe Apoſtles would hardly have paſſed them over in ſilence, or without cautioning other perſons againſt following ſuch examples. The circumſtance likewiſe, to which the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews alludes, ch. x. 25. that ſeveral, who ſtill continued Chriſtians, forſook the places of public worſhip, does not occur in any other Epiſtle, and implies a general and continued perſecution, which deterred the Chriſtians from an open confeſſion of their faith.

In this melancholy ſituation, the Hebrews almoſt reduced to deſpair are reſcued, ch. x. 25. 35—38. to the promiſed coming of Chriſt, which they are requeſted to await with patience, as being not far diſtant. This can be no other, than the promiſed deſtruction of Jeruſalem, Matth. xxiv. of which Chriſt himſelf ſaid, Luke xxi. 28, 'When theſe things begin to come to paſs, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh.' Now this coming of Chriſt was to the Chriſtians in Paleſtine a deliverance from the yoke, with which they were oppreſſed: but it had no ſuch influence on the Chriſtians of other countries. On the contrary, the firſt perſecution under Nero happened in the year 65, about two years before the commencement of the Jewiſh war, and the ſecond under Domitian, about five and twenty years after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem.

From

From ch. xiii. 7., though no mention is made in expreſs terms of martyrs, who had ſuffered in the cauſe of Chriſtianity, we may with great probability infer that ſeveral perſons had really ſuffered, and afforded a noble example to their brethren [l]. If this inference be juſt, the Hebrews, to whom this Epiſtle was written, muſt have been inhabitants of Paleſtine; for in no other part of the Roman Empire, before the year 65, had the enemies of Chriſtianity the power of perſecuting its profeſſors in ſuch a manner as to deprive them of their lives, becauſe no Roman court of juſtice would have condemned a man to death merely for religious opinions; and the pretence of the Jews, that whoever acknowledged Jeſus for the Meſſias was guilty of treaſon againſt the Emperor, was too ſophiſtical to be admitted by a Roman magiſtrate. But in Paleſtine, Stephen and the elder James had already ſuffered martyrdom [m]; both St. Peter and St. Paul had been in imminent danger of undergoing the ſame fate [n]; and according to Joſephus ſeveral other perſons were put to death, during the High-prieſthood of the younger Ananus about the year 64 or 65. The words of Joſephus are as follow [o]: 'The younger Ananus, who had obtained the office of High Prieſt, was a man of deſperate character, of the ſect of the Sadducees, who, as I have obſerved in other places, were in general ſevere in their puniſhments. This Ananus embraced the opportunity of acting according to his inclination, after the death of Feſtus, and before the arrival of his ſucceſſor Albinus. In this interval he conſtituted a court of juſtice, and brought before it James, a brother of Jeſus, who was called Chriſt, and ſeveral others, where they were accuſed of having violated the law, and were condemned to be ſtoned to death. But the more moderate part of the city, and they who ſtrictly adhered to the law, diſapproved highly of this meaſure.'

The

[l] See my notes to this paſſage.

[m] Acts vii. xii.

[n] Acts xii. 3—6. xxiii. 11—21. 26. 30.

[o] Antiquit. xx. 9. 1.

The preceding arguments, which I have here ſtated in a ſhort compaſs, the reader will find delivered more at large in my Diſſertation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews[m]. There are likewiſe other circumſtances mentioned in this Epiſtle, which, though leſs important and leſs deciſive, ſtill lead to the opinion, that it was written for the uſe of Chriſtians in Jeruſalem or Paleſtine. For inſtance, ch. xiii. 9. appears to allude to offerings, which at that time were conſidered as a part of the Jewiſh, and even of the Chriſtian ſervice: for that this paſſage has no reference to unclean meats, I think I have clearly ſhewn in my note to it. But if the paſſage really alludes to offerings, the Epiſtle muſt have been written to perſons, who lived where offerings were made. Now this was practicable only in Jeruſalem, for it was unlawful to offer ſacrifices any where but in the temple. Again, ch. xiii. 12, 13, 14. 'Wherefore Jeſus alſo, that he might ſanctify the people with his own blood, ſuffered without the gate: let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing the reproach, for here we have no continuing city, but ſeek one to come,' is very difficult to be explained on the ſuppoſition that the Epiſtle was written to Hebrews, who lived out of Paleſtine: for neither in the Acts of the Apoſtles, nor in the other Epiſtles, do we meet with an inſtance of expulſion from the ſynagogue merely for a belief in Chriſt, on the contrary the Apoſtles themſelves were permitted to teach openly in the Jewiſh aſſemblies. But if we ſuppoſe that the Epiſtle was written to Jewiſh converts in Jeruſalem, this paſſage becomes perfectly clear, eſpecially if it was written only a ſhort time before the commencement of the Jewiſh war, about the year 65 or 66. The Chriſtians namely on this ſuppoſition, are exhorted to endure their fate with patience, if they ſhould be obliged to retire, or even be ignominiouſly expelled from Jeruſalem, ſince Chriſt himſelf had been forced out of this very city, and had ſuffered without its walls. It was a city devoted to deſtruction, and they who fled from it had

to

[m] Sect. 8.

to expect a better in heaven. The diſciples of Chriſt had been already warned by their maſter to flee from Jeruſalem [n], and the time aſſigned for their flight could, when this Epiſtle was written, be not far diſtant. That they actually followed his advice, appears from the relation of Euſebius [o]: and according to Joſephus [p], the moſt ſenſible inhabitants of Jeruſalem took ſimilar meaſures, after the retreat of Ceſtius Gallus, which happened in November 66, and likewiſe left the city. If we ſuppoſe therefore, that the Epiſtle was written to the Hebrews of Jeruſalem, the paſſage in queſtion is clear: but on the hypotheſis, that it was written to Hebrews, who lived in any other place, the words εξερχωμεθα προς αυτον εξω της παρεμβολης, τον ονειδισμον αυτου φεροντες, loſe their meaning. Further, ch. x. 25. 'Not forſaking the aſſembling of ourſelves together, as the manner of ſome is, but exhorting one another, and ſo much the more, as ye ſee the day approaching,' is an additional confirmation of my opinion. The 'approaching day' can mean only the day appointed for the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the downfall of the Jewiſh nation: but this event immediately concerned only the Hebrews of Paleſtine, and could have no influence, in determining the inhabitants of other countries, ſuch as Aſia Minor, Greece, and Spain, either to forſake or to frequent the places of public worſhip.

The objections, which have been made to the opinion, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written to the Hebrews of Paleſtine, I have anſwered at large in the ninth ſection of my Diſſertation on this Epiſtle. Some of them are extremely weak: for inſtance, that which was made by Wall from ch. xiii. 18, 19. 'Pray for us, for we truſt we have a good conſcience, in all things willing to live honeſtly: but I beſeech you the rather to do this, that I may be reſtored to you the ſooner,' a paſſage, which, in Wall's opinion, would not ſuit an Epiſtle written to a community, in which St. Paul had not paſſed

[n] Matth. xxiv. 15—22.
[o] Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. III. cap. 5.
[p] Bell. Jud. ii. 20. 1.

paſſed fourteen days. But this objection implies, what is a matter of very great doubt, that St. Paul was the author of it. Even were this matter certain, inſtead of being doubtful, yet St. Paul had been ſeveral times at Jeruſalem, he had collected alms in diſtant countries for the Chriſtians of that city, and brought them in perſon: and even if the caſe were otherwiſe, ſtill it might be ſaid of an Apoſtle, who had been releaſed from difficulty and danger, that he was reſtored to the Chriſtians of every country. Nor is Wetſtein's argument, which is founded on ch. xiii. 24. 'they of Italy ſalute you,' of greater weight. Wetſtein namely contends, that the brethren of Italy could have had no acquaintance with the Jewiſh converts in Jeruſalem, by which, if I underſtand him rightly, he means perſonal acquaintance. But that they really had, is ſurely not improbable, ſince the Jews, who lived in countries at a diſtance from Paleſtine, ſometimes went up to Jeruſalem to celebrate the grand feſtivals: and even if Wetſtein's aſſertion admitted of no doubt, yet it frequently happens that mutual ſalutations are ſent from thoſe, who are not perſonally known to each other.

But there is an objection, which is really of ſome importance. It appears from ch. xiii. 23. that St. Paul intended to pay a viſit to thoſe Hebrews, to whom he addreſſed the Epiſtle. But it may be thought improbable, that he would take another journey to Jeruſalem, which was not only at a conſiderable diſtance from Rome, but was the place where he had firſt fallen into the captivity, which had laſted ſeveral years. It is true, that before his laſt viſit to Jeruſalem he foreſaw the danger which would attend him there, and that this danger did not deter him from the proſecution of his journey [q]: and Lardner has obſerved, that ſince St. Paul had been finally acquitted in Rome, he had leſs reaſon to apprehend any future moleſtation from the Jews. But on the other hand, it may be aſked, whether it would not have been imprudent in St. Paul to have returned to a city, where the

[q] Acts xx. 22—25. xxi. 10—14.

the captain of the Roman guard, to ſecure him from open violence, had judged it neceſſary to give him an eſcort of four hundred and ſeventy men: and, whether the Roman magiſtrates, at the time of his acquittal, would not have cautioned him againſt going to a place, where the ſafety of his perſon would occaſion difficulty to the government, and perhaps the ſhedding of blood. The objection delivered in this form appears to be of ſome weight: but then it preſuppoſes that St. Paul was the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, which is very far from being certain. I ſhall therefore conſider it in a ſubſequent ſection.

SECT. V.

Of the opinion of other writers on the queſtion, who the Hebrews were, to whom this Epiſtle was ſent.

IT is neceſſary at preſent, that I ſhould give at leaſt a ſhort account of the opinions of other writers on this ſubject: but a particular confutation of them muſt not be expected, ſince I have already aſſigned, in the preceding ſection, the reaſons which induce me to diſſent, and which it would be uſeleſs to repeat. From the liſt of opinions, which I am going to enumerate, I exclude however that, which makes the Epiſtle written to the Hebrews in general, diſperſed throughout the world: for in ſuch a general Epiſtle, the author of it, whether St. Paul, or any other perſon, could certainly not have written, ch. xiii. 23. that as ſoon as Timothy arrived he intended to pay them a viſit. The following then are the ſeveral opinions, relative to the Hebrews, to whom this Epiſtle was addreſſed.

1. That they were Hebrews in Aſia Minor, namely, in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Aſia, and Bithynia; to which

which ſome writers likewiſe add Achaia and Macedonia. This opinion is grounded on the ſuppoſition, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews is quoted by St. Peter: but as I have already ſhewn in the third ſection of this chapter, that ſuch a ſuppoſition is incapable of defence, the opinion, which reſts on it, loſes all ſupport. Other objections to this opinion have been delivered in the laſt ſection.

2. That they were Hebrews in Aſia Minor, who had fled into that country from Jeruſalem, a ſhort time before its deſtruction. This opinion was advanced by the great Newton, in his Obſervations on the Apocalypſe, p. 244: but this likewiſe ſuppoſes that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was quoted by St. Peter, and therefore likewiſe falls with that ſuppoſition. Beſides, there is no hiſtorical evidence for the aſſertion, that Jews fled to Aſia Minor from Jeruſalem, before the deſtruction of the city: for the accounts on record make mention of no other flight, than that to Pella.

3. Wetſtein in his Preface to this Epiſtle, Vol. II. p. 386. of his Greek Teſtament, contends that it was addreſſed to Hebrews in Rome.

4. Others, for inſtance the late Ludwig, ſuppoſe that it was ſent to Hebrews in Spain. This conjecture took its origin from the circumſtance that in ch. xiii. 23. a viſit was promiſed to the Hebrews, and St. Paul in his Epiſtle to the Romans, ch. xv. 24. expreſſed an intention, after he had been in Italy, of going to Spain. But this conjecture is again founded on the ſuppoſition, that St. Paul was the author of the Epiſtle, and moreover takes for granted, that the intention was actually put in execution, though we have no knowledge of it, and though five years muſt have elapſed, before it could have been executed. Beſides, the paſſage itſelf, to which appeal is made in the Epiſtle to the Romans, is unfavourable to the opinion, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was addreſſed to Hebrews in Spain: for St. Paul intended to go to Spain becauſe the Goſpel had not been preached there; whereas the

Hebrews,

Hebrews, to whom the Epiſtle in queſtion was addreſſed, already formed very flouriſhing Chriſtian communities, which were in danger of falling back from Chriſtianity to Judaiſm. Further, the whole Epiſtle has the appearance of being written to perſons, with whoſe circumſtances the author was intimately acquainted: but the circumſtances of Chriſtian communities in Spain could not have been ſo well known to St. Paul, before he had ever been in that country.

5. In the opinion of Dr. Noeſſelt, this Epiſtle was ſent to the Theſſalonians, and likewiſe to the Macedonians in general, and was the firſt which St. Paul wrote; for this opinion alſo is founded on the ſuppoſition that St. Paul was the author. It is delivered in a treatiſe entitled, De tempore, quo ſcripta fuerit Epiſtola ad Ebræos, deque Ebræis, quibus ſcripſerit, publiſhed in the firſt volume of his Opuſcula, printed in 1771, and reprinted in 1785. And as the arguments, by which it is ſupported, are delivered in ſuch a manner, as to render it very plauſible, it will be neceſſary to give a ſhort ſtatement of them, with references to the ſections of the treatiſe, in which they are contained. Dr. Noeſſelt contends then, that it was the firſt Epiſtle, which was written by St. Paul, that he wrote it at Corinth, and ſent it to the Macedonians, eſpecially to thoſe at Theſſalonica. (§ 11.) In Macedonia were many Jews, and likewiſe, as appears from the Acts of the Apoſtles, many proſelytes to Judaiſm, who were alſo included under the name of Hebrews. (§ 12. 13.) 'They of Italy,' mentioned ch. xiii. 24. are Aquilas and Priſcilla, with other Jews, who were lately arrived at Corinth, in conſequence of their baniſhment from Rome by Claudius, Acts xviii. 2. Aquilas had a Jewiſh ſchool in his houſe in Rome (την κατ' οικον αυτων εκκλησιαν, Rom. xvi. 5.) in conſequence of which he was known to the Jews of Macedonia. From Hebr. xiii. 23. it appears, that Timothy had been ſent away: this St. Paul had done at Corinth. Compare 1 Theſſ. ii. 18. iii. 1. Acts xviii. 8. The Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written before the firſt to the Theſſalonians,

lonians, which is the reaſon why the latter contains none of the melancholy of the former, for the Theſſalonian community had been amended by it. (§ 8.) In ch. x. 34. Dr. Noeſſelt adopts the common reading, τοις δεσμοις, which other critics reject, and underſtands theſe bonds, on which the Hebrews had pity, as denoting St. Paul's impriſonment at Philippi, Acts xvi. 24. 26. (§ 9. 10.) At Theſſalonica likewiſe St. Paul was in danger, and was reſcued by his friends there. Jaſon was deprived of his property, becauſe the avaricious magiſtrates of Theſſalonica had demanded of him bail for St. Paul, Acts xvii. 9. which he forfeited in conſequence of St. Paul's not appearing: moreover his houſe was plundered, and he himſelf was forced to quit Theſſalonica, for it appears from Rom. xvi. 21. that he was with St. Paul at Corinth[1]. (§ 14).

Theſe are the outlines of what Dr. Noeſſelt has advanced on this ſubject: but I think his repreſentation of the matter rather improbable. That Macedonian Jews, who ſpake only Greek, ſhould be called Hebrews, is hardly credible, and ſtill leſs ſo, that uncircumciſed heathen proſelytes ſhould receive this appellation: at leaſt, I cannot admit this application of the word, till examples have been produced of its having been actually uſed in this extraordinary ſenſe. The bonds of St. Paul, or his impriſonment at Philippi, were not of a nature to excite much pity: for on the day after his impriſonment, the magiſtrates aſſembled in a body, and requeſted him to leave the priſon, by which meaſure they made him ample ſatisfaction, ſo that their proceedings, inſtead of raiſing pity, muſt rather excite a ſmile. The caſe would be different, if the queſtion related to the ſtripes which had been inflicted on St. Paul at Philippi: but in the preſent inquiry we are concerned only with the word 'bonds.' If Jaſon gave bail for St. Paul[2], and the Apoſtle

[1] That Jaſon was with St. Paul at Corinth, is no proof, that he was obliged to quit Theſſalonica.

[2] The term 'avaricious,' which D. Noeſſelt applies to the magiſtrates at Philippi is without foundation; nor can this epithet be juſtly applied to any of the Greek or Roman magiſtrates mentioned in the Acts of the Apoſtles.

Apoſtle neglected to appear before the court, the forfeiture of the bail cannot be conſidered as an inſtance of ſuffering for the ſake of Chriſt: and a man's being obliged to make good his engagements cannot properly be termed a confiſcation of his property. But it appears to me, that the ſecurity, which the magiſtrates of Philippi demanded of Jaſon, was by no means for the appearance of St. Paul before the court, as commentators generally ſuppoſe, but that he would not admit the Apoſtle in future into his houſe: for Jaſon could hardly give ſecurity for St. Paul's appearance, ſince the Apoſtle had already eſcaped from Jaſon's houſe, and was no where to be found at Philippi. Further, a compariſon of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews with thoſe to the Theſſalonians clearly ſhews, that they were written to perſons of a very different deſcription. And laſtly, if the Epiſtle, called the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, was an Epiſtle to the inhabitants of Theſſalonica, it was without doubt written in Greek: but if it was written originally in Greek, it could not have been written by St. Paul, whoſe Greek ſtyle is very different from that, which appears in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. I might add, that the Theſſalonians, when St. Paul wrote to them, had been only a ſhort time converted to Chriſtianity, which cannot be affirmed of the perſons, to whom the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was addreſſed. But what I have already ſaid on this ſubject is ſufficient.

SECT. VI.

Of the ſituation of the community, to which the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was addreſſed.

THE ſituation of the perſons, to whom this Epiſtle was addreſſed, is evident from its contents, whence it appears, that they had endured ſevere perſecutions, which had begun with the commencement of Chriſtianity (ch. x. 32.), and had ſince increaſed, ſo that ſeveral of their principal teachers, among whom we may probably reckon St. James, had been put to death, ch. vi. x. xi. xii. 4—12. xiii. 7, 13. Hence the community was brought into imminent danger of apoſtatizing from the faith: ſome of its members appear to have actually returned to Judaiſm, and even to have blaſphemed Chriſt, of whoſe amendment the author entertains very little hopes, ch. vi. 4—8. x. 26—31. Others wavered in the faith, while others again continued Chriſtians in their hearts, but were afraid to frequent the aſſemblies of public worſhip, ch. x. 24, 25. At the ſame time it appears from the whole Epiſtle, that the Adverſaries of the Chriſtian religion endeavoured to recall its converts back again to Judaiſm by arguments, ſimilar to thoſe, which the Jews in modern times have advanced, though in a ſomewhat different ſhape: they contended namely, that the Moſaic religion was delivered and confirmed in a manner ſuperior to the Chriſtian, that the former was certainly a divine religion, and therefore not to be abandoned. The author of the Epiſtle is ſo very diffuſe in his anſwers, and has introduced ſo much learning, eſpecially in reſpect to the prieſthood of Melchiſedec, as implies, that many of the perſons, to whom it was addreſſed, were well acquainted with rabbinical literature: at leaſt no Epiſtle in the whole New Teſtament is ſo learned, as that in queſtion.

A part

A part of the hiſtory of this community, to which alluſion is made, ch. xiii. 8, 9, 10. entirely fails us, which, if we were acquainted with it, would throw great light on the Epiſtle, eſpecially on this obſcure paſſage.' From the words, 'Jeſus Chriſt, the ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever,' taken in their connexion with the ſeventh verſe, 'Remember them which have the rule over you, who have ſpoken unto you the word of God, whoſe faith below, conſidering the end of their converſation,' I can draw no other concluſion, than that ſeveral members of the community had endeavoured to introduce into Chriſtianity ſome doctrines different from thoſe, which had been taught by their former teachers, eſpecially by St. James. This appears more plainly, when we read further, 'Be not carried about with divers and ſtrange doctrines.' The queſtion cannot here relate to the retaining of the Levitical law, as a ſyſtem of unchangeable and eternal commands of the Deity; for this was no new doctrine among the Chriſtians at Jeruſalem, all of whom, even after they had become converts to Chriſtianity, remained zealouſly attached to the law of Moſes, Acts xxi. 20. Immediately after (Heb. xiii. 9.), the ſubject relates to offerings; 'It is a good thing that the heart be eſtabliſhed with grace, not with meats, which have not profited them, which have been occupied therein. We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat, which ſerve the tabernacle.' This likewiſe was nothing new at Jeruſalem: and when St. Paul, Acts xxi. 23—26. defrayed the expences neceſſary for the performance of ſome Nazarite vows, the ceremonies were accompanied with offerings. See Numb. vi. 14, 15. where a ram is ordered for a meat-offering, and ver. 20. where the Nazarite, after the fulfilling of his vow, is permitted again to drink wine. I am inclined therefore to ſuppoſe, that attempts had been made to introduce offerings as a part of the Chriſtian ſervice, perhaps general offerings in the name of the whole community:

but,

but, as we have no hiſtorical evidence for the aſſertion, I advance the opinion merely as conjecture.

That the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews believed in the divinity of Chriſt, is manifeſt from what he ſays, ch. i. 2, 3. But, when I conſider what pains he has taken, ver. 4—14. to prove that Chriſt is greater than the angels, and in the third chapter that he is greater than Moſes, I conclude, that the perſons, to whom it was ſent, were not univerſally convinced, that Chriſt was God: for if they were, they were of courſe convinced, that he was greater than Moſes and the angels, a point therefore, which it would have been uſeleſs to have proved by ſo many quotations. But on this ſubject I muſt requeſt the reader to examine my Notes to this part of the Epiſtle, where it will appear, that the author of it has taken his proofs, not from the divinity of Chriſt, of which the quoted paſſages cannot be explained without the utmoſt violence and perverſion, but from the ſacerdotal office of Jeſus, and the biblical as well as the Jewiſh doctrine of angels. That many of the Jewiſh Chriſtians, the Ebionites for inſtance, conſidered Chriſt as a mere man, is a known fact. If therefore a writer, in order to obviate the arguments for a return to Judaiſm, undertook to convince ſuch perſons, that the Chriſtian religion was not inferior to the Moſaic, either in ſublimity or in the divinity of its origin, nor to be leſs valued than the law, which was given by the miniſtration of angels, it was neceſſary to argue from data, which they already granted, and not to found his reaſoning on principles, of which they would not have admitted the truth.

SECT. VII.

Of the time when, and the place where, this Epiſtle was written.

AFTER that, which I have already ſaid on the perſecution of the Chriſtians under the younger Ananus, and the martyrdom of St. James, I muſt conclude, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was not written till after the death of the Procurator Feſtus, in the year 64, which was immediately followed by the perſecution under Ananus, the author of the Epiſtle having already experienced its effects on the Hebrews, who began to waver in the faith, to forſake the places of public worſhip, and ſome of them even to apoſtatize. This date agrees likewiſe with the circumſtance, that in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, ch. x. 28. 37—39. the coming of the Lord, namely to hold judgement over Jeruſalem, is deſcribed as being at hand: for the Jewiſh war commenced in the year 67, and in 70 Jeruſalem was taken and deſtroyed. But I apprehend, that it was written before the troubles actually commenced, and therefore not during the government of Ceſtius Gallus: for though I believe, that the Chriſtians in Paleſtine, at leaſt thoſe, who deſerved the name, (for I do not include thoſe, who expected the coming of the Meſſiah to overthrow the Roman power, and eſtabliſh a temporal kingdom[t]) did not entertain any rebellious principles, yet I think, if it had been written ſo late as the year 66, when matters were ripe for rebellion, it would have contained ſome alluſion to the exiſting troubles, with advice to the Chriſtians, not to take part in the public diſturbances.

Nearly the ſame date has been aſſigned to this Epiſtle by other commentators, who argue from ch. xiii. 23. where

[t] Mark xiii. 6. Luke xxi. 8.

where the author expreſſes his intention of viſiting the perſons, to whom he is writing: and it was about this time, that St. Paul was releaſed from his firſt impriſonment in Rome, or at leaſt had expectations of a ſpeedy releaſe. But the quoted paſſage is rather too obſcure, to warrant an inference in reſpect to the date of the Epiſtle: and as the argument entirely reſts on the ſuppoſition, that St. Paul was the author, it can have no force, till this point has been eſtabliſhed.

With reſpect to the place, it is leſs eaſy to determine where it was, than where it was not written. Moſt commentators ſuppoſe, that it was written in Italy, becauſe the author ſays, ch. xiii. 24. Ασπαζονται υμας οι απο της Ιταλιας: but the inference, which I deduce from this paſſage, is the very reverſe. If the author had written in Rome, he would have ſent ſalutations from the Romans, who cannot be meant by the expreſſion οι απο της Ιταλιας: for whoever writes in Rome, and uſes this expreſſion, can mean only perſons, who came from other parts of Italy. But it is incredible, that ſalutations ſhould be ſent in an Epiſtle written in Rome from unknown perſons in the Italian provinces to the Hebrews in Paleſtine, and none from the Romans themſelves. Indeed, I am of opinion, that the Epiſtle was written no where in Italy, for the phraſe οι απο της Ιταλιας implies, that theſe perſons were *out* of Italy, and cannot ſignify perſons, who were then *in* Italy. Conſequently, the author of the Epiſtle, who communicated theſe ſalutations from perſons, who perhaps had accompanied him from Italy, was likewiſe abſent from that country, perhaps in Greece. Further, it appears to have been written in a place, which had little or no connexion with Jeruſalem, for otherwiſe the author would have ſent ſalutations at leaſt from ſome of the principal members of the Chriſtian community in that place. Any thing further on this ſubject I am unable to determine, and candidly confeſs my ignorance, as to the place, where the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written. Nor do I envy any man, who pretends to know more

on this ſubject, unleſs he has diſcovered ſources of intelligence, which have hitherto remained unknown. It is better to leave a queſtion in a ſtate of uncertainty, than, without foundation, to adopt an opinion, which may lead to material errors.

SECT. VIII.

Of the language, in which this Epiſtle was written.

I NOW come to the point, which has occaſioned the greateſt debate relative to this Epiſtle, namely, in what language it was written. On this head there are two principal opinions:

1. That it was written in Greek. This opinion has been very generally adopted in modern times; at leaſt, if we may judge from the authors, who have written on the ſubject, for perhaps many readers think differently.

2. That it was written in Hebrew, and tranſlated into Greek. This was the general opinion of the ancients; and it is that, which I adopt.

Before we proceed to the examination of this queſtion, we muſt examine what is meant by the word 'Hebrew.' When ancient writers aſſert, that this Epiſtle was written in Hebrew, we muſt not immediately conclude, that they meant the language, which we call by this name. For this term may denote,

1. Either the language, in which the greateſt part of the Old Teſtament was written, and to which we give the appellation of Hebrew. It is true, that this was no longer a living language, when the New Teſtament was written, yet the Jews ſtill uſed it as the language of prayer, both in Paleſtine and in the Eaſtern Aſia, and it was underſtood by every man of education.

The earlier part of the Talmud, the Miſhna, was likewiſe written in this language.

2. Or Chaldee, that is, the Aramæan dialect ſpoken in Babylon and Aſſyria. This was the language ſpoken by the Jews of Jeruſalem and Judæa, in the time of Chriſt, as the Jews of Galilee ſpake Syriac, another Aramæan dialect, though very corruptly.

Which of the two explanations ought to be adopted I cannot at preſent determine, and therefore I ſhall take the word 'Hebrew' in its moſt extenſive ſenſe, as including both Chaldee and Syriac, as well as that, which is commonly called Hebrew.

SECT. IX.

According to the moſt ancient tradition, or opinion, the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written originally in Hebrew.

THE moſt ancient tradition, or opinion, relative to the language of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, is, that its original was Hebrew, and that what we have at preſent is a Greek tranſlation of it. We have no accounts of it, which reach ſo far as the firſt century: but in the ſecond century, Clement of Alexandria, who lived a hundred years, or three generations, after St. Paul, has, in a paſſage quoted by Euſebius from a work, which is now loſt, given the following relation: 'That it was written by St. Paul in the Hebrew language for the uſe of the Hebrews, and that St. Luke tranſlated it for the benefit of the Greeks, whence there is a ſimilarity obſervable between the tranſlation of this Epiſtle

Epistle and the Acts of the Apostles[u].' I quote the words of Clement preserved by Eusebius, not as historical evidence, but merely to shew what was the most ancient tradition or opinion. That part, which relates to St. Luke, as the translator, is undoubtedly false; for instead of there being a similarity between the style of the Epistle to the Hebrews and that of the Acts of the Apostles, there is really so considerable a difference, that they cannot have proceeded from the same writer. And the clause, which immediately follows the words, which have been just quoted, 'St. Paul did not call himself an Apostle, that he might not make a disagreeable impression on the Hebrews, and because he was not the Apostle of the Jews,' is so far from being historically true, that it is nothing more than a very weak conjecture[w].

Eusebius himself, where he delivers his own opinion, agrees in the main point with Clement of Alexandria: for speaking of Clement of Rome[x], who had quoted whole passages from this Epistle, though without naming it, Eusebins first argues in favour of its antiquity, and then proceeds as follows. 'As St. Paul wrote to the Hebrews in their own language (δια της πατριȣ γλωττης), some suppose that St. Luke, others that our Clement translated the Epistle, which latter supposition, on account of the similarity of style, appears to me the most probable.' Jerom likewise, though he doubts, whether St. Paul was the author, says hypothetically, after he had noticed the difference in the language, 'Scripserat ut Hebræis Hebraice, id est, suo eloquio disertissime, ut ea quæ eloquenter scrip-

serat

[u] Παυλȣ ειναι φησι, γεγραφθαι δε Ἑβραιοις Ἑβραικῃ φωνῃ· Λȣκαν δε φιλοτιμως αυτην μεθερμηνευσαντα εκδȣναι τοις Ἑλλησιν, ὁθεν τον αυτον χρωτα ἑυρισκεσθαι κατα την ἑρμηνειαν ταυτης δε της επιστολης, και των πραξεων. Eusebii Hist. Eccles. Lib. VI. c. 14.

[w] See Sect. 2. of this Chapter.

[x] Hist. Eccles. Lib. III. c. 38.

ſerat in Hebræo, verterentur in Græcum: et hanc cauſam eſſe *aiunt*, quod a cæteris Pauli Epiſtolis diſcrepare videatur.' It is manifeſt therefore, that theſe accounts are not hiſtory, but opinion: it was taken for granted, that St. Paul was the author, whoſe mode of writing being different from that obſervable in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, it was inferred, that the Greek was not the original: but of the tranſlator they had no knowledge, and delivered merely their own conjectures. Further, the accounts of ancient writers on this ſubject are at variance with each other: for Origen, though a diſciple of Clement of Alexandria, makes no mention whatever of a Hebrew original, but ſays only: 'In my opinion the matter was from St. Paul, but the language and conſtruction of the words from another, who recorded the thoughts of the Apoſtle, and made notes, as it were, of what was ſaid by his maſter[y].'

The queſtion therefore muſt be decided without an appeal to hiſtorical evidence, ſince it appears, that we have in fact none: and it is really to be lamented, that Clement of Rome, though he has frequently produced paſſages from this Epiſtle, has not once mentioned, who was the author of it. External evidence then being defective, we muſt have recourſe to internal.

[y] Απομνημονευσαντος τα αποστολικα, και ὡσπερει σχολιογραφησαντος τα ειρημενα ὑπο τυ διδασκαλυ.

SECT. X.

Arguments in favour of the opinion, that this Epiſtle was written in Hebrew.

THE firſt argument, which induces me to believe, that this Epiſtle was written in Hebrew, is, that it was written for the uſe of the Hebrews (as ſome of the ancients, quoted in the preceding paragraph, have related), by which I underſtand Jewiſh Chriſtians in Jeruſalem. Now as Chaldee was the language generally ſpoken by the people in Jeruſalem, and Hebrew, or, as I would rather call it, Talmudic, was the language of the learned, and alſo the language of the church, and of prayer, I cannot ſuppoſe, that a man, who was maſter of the Hebrew, would write to a community at Jeruſalem in any other language. When St. Paul ſpake in public before the Jews in Jeruſalem, he addreſſed them in Hebrew, as St. Luke expreſsly relates, Acts xxi. 40. xxii. 2.: if then St. Paul was the author of the Epiſtle, it is incredible, that he ſhould have written to them in Greek. It is true, that there were many individuals in Jeruſalem, who underſtood Greek, for inſtance the Romans, the men of the higheſt rank among the Jews, with ſuch of the Helleniſts as were ſettled there, and who are diſtinguiſhed, Acts vi. 1. from the Hebrews: but the greateſt part of the inhabitants were certainly unacquainted with Greek, and therefore the author of an Epiſtle, containing matters of ſo much conſequence as the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, would have hardly written in this language, eſpecially as the Jewiſh converts at Jeruſalem were for the moſt part perſons of inferior rank. Nay, I believe, that not all the teachers of the Chriſtian community in Jeruſalem, and very few among the Rabbins, would have underſtood a Greek Epiſtle.

The preceding argument would indeed be deprived of its force, were it true (what Iſaac Voſſius has aſſerted) that Greek was the native language of the Jews of Jeruſalem. But this aſſertion, which is contrary to all our hiſtorical and philological knowledge, I have confuted at large in the eleventh ſection of my Diſſertation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. Lardner likewiſe objects, that Greek, if not the native language of the Jews of Jeruſalem, was at leaſt underſtood by many of them. But this objection is of no value whatſoever. Let us take an inſtance in modern times, and the thing will ſpeak for itſelf. In Hamburg for inſtance, the Engliſh language is underſtood by a very conſiderable part of the inhabitants; yet if the caſe ſhould occur, that apprehenſions were entertained of an apoſtacy from the Chriſtian religion, and that too among the lower claſſes, no man, who was able to write German, would think of addreſſing to the people of Hamburg a paſtoral letter written in Engliſh. The tradition therefore recorded by Clement of Alexandria in the ſecond century is confirmed by its own internal probability.

It is true, that this argument reſts on the ſuppoſition, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was deſigned for the Hebrews in Jeruſalem; and therefore neither Dr. Noeſſelt, who contends, that it was ſent to the Theſſalonians, nor they, who aſſert, that it was intended for the Chriſtians in Aſia Minor, will allow the argument to be valid. But ſince the advocates for both of theſe opinions maintain, that St. Paul was the author, they muſt admit, that the following argument is valid, which I deliver indeed only hypothetically, but which no man can confute, if it be true, that this Epiſtle was written by St. Paul[z].

The Greek Epiſtle to the Hebrews, in the form in which we have it at preſent, cannot poſſibly be St. Paul's

[z] In my Diſſertation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, Sect. 13. I have made ſome other obſervations, which tend to confirm the following argument, and to confute the objections to it.

Paul's original: for his manner of writing Greek is totally different, whether we regard the choice of ſingle words, the mode of connecting them, or the conſtruction and rotundity of the periods. Origen, whom every one will admit to be a competent judge on this ſubject, ſays [a], 'This Epiſtle has not that peculiarity, which belongs to the Apoſtle, and which immediately diſcovers his writing, but in the conſtruction of the language is better Greek (συνθεσει της λεξεως Ελληνικωτερα). This every one will admit, who is able to diſtinguiſh the difference of ſtyles. Other critics in the time of Jerom perceived likewiſe the ſame difference: for this learned father, in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers [b], ſays: 'Epiſtola, quæ fertur ad Hebræos, non ejus creditur propter ſtyli ſermoniſque diſſonantiam.' Whenever I read therefore this Epiſtle, I cannot avoid feeling an aſtoniſhment, that ſo many modern writers on this ſubject, ſome of whom undoubtedly are judges of the Greek language, ſhould miſtake the Greek of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews for the Greek of St. Paul. This miſtake ariſes perhaps, partly from the early imbibed prejudice, that all the canonical books of the New Teſtament were written in Greek, and partly from the circumſtance, that we read the Greek Teſtament at ſchool, at a time when we are unable to judge of the difference of ſtyle, and thus become ſo accuſtomed to it, that we are rendered unable at a later age to diſtinguiſh between the modes of compoſition, which are viſible in the ſeveral parts of it. Carpzov, one of the moſt learned advocates for the opinion, that the Greek Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul, has made the following conceſſion, in his Exercitationes in Epiſtolam ad Hebræos, p. 91. 'Si quis orationem Pauli adcurate notavit, ſtilum in hac ad Hebræos diſſimilem aliquanto cognoſcet eſſe illius, quo Apoſtolus in reliquis epiſtolis uſus eſt. Nam caſtitas Græcæ, linguæ,

[a] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. VI. cap. 25.

[b] Hieron. Op. Tom. IV. p. ii. p. 103.

linguæ, pauciores Hebraiſmi, phraſeſque Cilicum aut Tarſenſium, particularum uſus elegantior, poſitus verborum valde venuſtus, flores hinc inde inſperſi, aliæ virtutes bene multæ, epiſtolæ huic vel eo nomine præ cæteris Paulinis prærogativam videntur concedere.' Yet this learned writer, notwithſtanding all theſe differences, ſtill contends, p. 81. that the Greek Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul, and that its ſuperiority to St. Paul's other Epiſtles aroſe from the circumſtance, that the Apoſtle had reſolved to exhibit a ſpecimen of fine writing, and to ſhew how well he was able to write Greek, whenever he choſe it.

Now, that St. Paul ever wrote an Epiſtle, as a kind of ſchool exerciſe in the Greek language, and that the Epiſtle, which he choſe for this purpoſe, was an Epiſtle, not to Greeks, but to Hebrews, appears, I think, highly improbable. Still more improbable is the opinion of Cramer[c], who aſcribes the difference in queſtion to St. Paul's intercourſe with the Greeks, and a conſequent improvement in the Apoſtle's Greek ſtyle. Strange, that a native of Tarſus, where Greek and good Greek was ſpoken, whom we find almoſt conſtantly in Greek cities, in the accounts, which are given of him from Acts xi. to xx. ſhould, after the four years and an half impriſonment, which he ſpent out of Greece, namely two years at Cæſarea in Paleſtine, where he was under a Roman guard, half a year at ſea and in the iſland of Malta, and two years at Rome, make ſuch a proficiency in the Greek language, as to be able to write in it much better than before.

That there are ſome, though very few Hebraiſms, in this Epiſtle, to which Cramer appeals, will not invalidate the argument derived from its ſtyle; and he ſeems to have miſtaken Origen and Jerom, who do not ſay, that it is written in perfectly pure Greek, but only, that it is written in better Greek than that, which was uſed by St. Paul. And if the Hebraiſms were ſtill more

[c] Pag. 37. of the Introduction prefixed to his Diſſertation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

more numerous, than they really are, they would no more prove, that St. Paul was the author of the Epiſtle, than the Hebraiſms, which are viſible in Cramer's own Odes and Pſalms, would prove theſe to be the work of the Apoſtle. It muſt be expected, not only that every Jewiſh, but every Greek writer, who was daily accuſtomed to the Septuagint, would occaſionally introduce Hebraiſms, unleſs, like Joſephus, who wrote, not for Jews, but for Greeks and Romans, he made pure and claſſic Greek his particular ſtudy.

Carpzov has collected in his Prolegomena to this Epiſtle, 76—78. expreſſions, which, in his opinion, betray the ſtyle of St. Paul: but whoever examines them, will find, that inſtead of proving the point, for which they are quoted, they rather ſhew the weakneſs of the cauſe, which this learned advocate undertook to ſupport. For inſtance, he compares Heb. ix. 14. απο νεκρων εργων, εις το λατρευειν Θεῳ ζωντι, with 1 Theſſ. i. 9. απο των ειδωλων, δουλευειν Θεῳ ζωντι και αληθινῳ. But in this example the uſe of δουλευειν in the latter inſtance, and of λατρευειν, which is finer Greek, in the former, muſt rather lead to the concluſion, that the paſſages proceeded from different writers. It is true, that they agree in the words Θεῳ ζωντι; but 'the living God' is a phraſe ſo common among the Jewiſh writers, that no inference whatſoever can be drawn from it; and ſince it likewiſe occurs in Matth. xvi. 16. John vi. 69. Acts xvi. 15. 1 Pet. i. 23. Rev ii. 2. we might with the ſame reaſon aſcribe likewiſe theſe books to St. Paul. Again, he compares Heb. iv. 16. προσερχωμεθα ουν μετα παρρησιας τῳ θρονῳ της χαριτος, with Epheſ. iii. 12. εν ᾧ ἐχομεν την παρρησιαν και την προσαγωγην εν πεποιθησει. Here the whole ſimilarity conſiſts in the word παρρησια, a word which frequently occurs in other books of the New Teſtament, and is uſed not leſs than four times in this very ſenſe in the firſt Epiſtle of St. John[d]. And even if the word παρρησια were peculiar

[d] Ch. ii. 28. iii. 21. iv. 17. v. 14.

peculiar to St. Paul, it would not prove, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written originally in Greek: for he might have uſed this word in a Hebrew Epiſtle, ſince it had been adopted by the Jews, and written פרהסיא [e]. On the contrary, this very example, like the preceding, affords an argument, and that too a very ſtrong one, in favour of the opinion, that the Greek Epiſtle to the Hebrews was not written by St. Paul. For in the paſſage quoted from Epheſ. iii. 12. is uſed the word προσαγωγη, a word peculiar to St. Paul, which not only does not occur in the parallel paſſage, which Carpzov has quoted from the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, but not in a ſingle inſtance in the whole Epiſtle. Nor do the other words peculiar to St. Paul, of which I have taken notice in the firſt volume of this Introduction [f], occur in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, except καταργειν, which we find in one inſtance, namely, ch. ii. 14. This example, which Carpzov overlooked, affords a ſtronger proof, than all the examples, which he has collected: but the uſe of a ſingle favorite word of St. Paul, and that too only in one inſtance, is hardly ſufficient to warrant the concluſion, that St. Paul wrote the Greek Epiſtle to the Hebrews, ſince a Greek tranſlator may have derived it from his intercourſe with St. Paul, in the ſame manner as St. Luke has done. Laſtly, that long parentheſes occur in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, as well as in the Epiſtles of St. Paul, is no proof, that the Greek is St. Paul's original, for parentheſes are commonly retained in a tranſlation.

We are reduced therefore to the following dilemma. If the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written originally in Greek, it was not written by St. Paul, in which caſe we have no ground for pronouncing it canonical. On the other hand, if St. Paul was the author, the Greek can be only a tranſlation, and the original muſt have been

[e] See Buxtorf Lex. Talm. p. 1804.

[f] Ch. iv. Sect. 8.

been Hebrew. It will be objected perhaps, that this is mere hypothetical reaſoning. I grant it: but the hypotheſis, which is laid down in the firſt poſition, I think hardly admits a doubt. Nor has it been called in queſtion, except by thoſe, who aſcribe the Epiſtle to St. Paul: but whoever aſcribes the Epiſtle to St. Paul, will not be able to confute the ſecond poſition.

But, in addition to theſe arguments, the frequent ſtudy of this Epiſtle has ſuggeſted to me another of a different kind, which applies with equal force, whether St. Paul was the author, or not, and whether the Epiſtle was ſent to the Hebrews of Paleſtine, or to the Hebrews of any other country. In this argument, which ſhall be the ſubject of the following ſection, nothing more is taken for granted, than that the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was a ſenſible and intelligent writer, which I think he was in a very great degree.

SECT. XI.

A new Argument to prove, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written in Hebrew, derived from the quotations, which are made in it from the Old Teſtament.

THE quotations from the Old Teſtament in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews are taken, as they are in general and with a very few exceptions in other books of the New Teſtament, from the Septuagint. Now this might have happened not only in an Epiſtle written originally in Greek, but likewiſe in a Greek tranſlation of an Epiſtle written originally in Hebrew, in the ſame manner as a German tranſlator of a theological work written in a foreign language would give the quotations from the Bible in the words uſed in Luther's verſion.

And

And that the quotations from the Septuagint in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews were really made by a tranſlator, and not by the author, appears from the circumſtance, that theſe quotations from the Bible in the words of the Septuagint are ſometimes foreign to the purpoſe, for which they were introduced, whereas the ſame paſſages, as worded in the Hebrew, are exactly in point. If in ſuch places the author himſelf had quoted the Old Teſtament in Greek, he would not have uſed the words of the Septuagint, but would have given his own Greek tranſlation of the Hebrew, as other writers of the New Teſtament have ſometimes done, eſpecially St. Paul.

An example of this kind is Heb. xi. 21. where a quotation is made from Gen. xlvii. 31. as a proof of Jacob's faith, that is, a confidence in things hoped for, in things not ſeen, as the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews has explained the term, ch. xi. 1. and as appears from the tenor of the whole chapter. To this ſenſe the paſſage quoted from Geneſis is, as worded in the Hebrew, perfectly well adapted. Jacob, foreſeeing that his death was not far diſtant, and thoroughly confiding in the divine promiſe, had demanded from Joſeph an oath, that he would bury him, not in Egypt, but in Paleſtine with his fathers Abraham and Iſaac: on which, according to the Hebrew words of the quoted paſſage, 'Joſeph ſwore, and Jacob bowed worſhipping on his bed.' That is, Jacob, who was then too infirm to raiſe himſelf from his bed, turned on his face, in a poſture of adoration, returned thanks to God, and embraced in faith the promiſe, that Paleſtine, the place of his interment, would once become the reſidence of his poſterity. Or, as it may be likewiſe explained, he returned thanks to God, that he ſhould lie with his fathers, with whom he hoped to be again united. I prefer however the former explanation. Let us now attend to this paſſage as worded in the Septuagint, and we ſhall ſee, that it conveys no meaning, which is at all ſuitable to the deſign, for which

the

the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews could have quoted it. The words of the Septuagint are, και προσεκυνησεν επι το ακρον της ραβδου αυτου, of which words the moſt rational tranſlation is, 'And he (Jacob) proſtrated himſelf in adoration before his (Joſeph's) ſtaff:' that is, he worſhipped God, who had fulfilled his dreams, made Joſeph to be governor over Egypt, and placed in his hand the ſtaff of regency. But then, this is not faith, in the ſenſe of confidence in things unſeen, or in events to come, for Joſeph was already arrived at the ſummit of power, and ſtood at that very time in Jacob's preſence. Other interpretations of this paſſage, which I have examined in my Diſſertation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, ſect. 14. are ſtill leſs to the purpoſe, for which the quotation is made in Heb. xi. 21. If it be objected, that the paſſage in queſtion is not quoted alone, but in company with the words, 'By faith Jacob, when he was dying, bleſſed both the ſons of Joſeph,' I anſwer, that this paſſage has, in the book of Geneſis, no connexion with the other: it relates to a different, and later event, which Moſes has recorded, Gen. xlviii. 1. as totally diſtinct from the preceding.

Again, the paſſage quoted in Heb. i. 7. from Pſalm civ. 4. can, as worded in the Greek, have no other meaning, than, 'He maketh his angels winds, and his miniſters flames of fire:' for αγγελους and λειτουργους have an article, but not πνευματα and φλογα. But this meaning is by no means ſuitable to the purpoſe, for which the quotation is made. On the contrary, the paſſage, as worded in the Hebrew, 'He maketh the winds his meſſengers, and flames of fire his miniſters,' is quite to the purpoſe, as I have ſhewn in the Notes to this Epiſtle, p. 100, 103. Winds and flaſhes of lightning are ſometimes called the angels (meſſengers) of God: and in this ſenſe the law, which was given on mount Sinai, may be ſaid to have been given by the miniſtration of angels.

Another

Another inſtance is a paſſage from Pſalm cx. 4. which is ſeveral times quoted and explained in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. This paſſage in the Hebrew text is על דברתי מלכיצדק, that is, 'over the ſanctuary of Melchiſedek[g].' Now this ſenſe is much more ſuitable to the purpoſe, for which the paſſage is quoted in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, than the obſcure and indeterminate Greek, κατα την ταξιν Μελχισεδεκ. The ſanctuary of Melchiſedek, who had no temple built by human hands, was heaven itſelf: and if we keep this ſenſe in view, when we read Heb. ix. 11. 23, 24. we ſhall perceive, that the author of the Epiſtle more probably wrote 'ſanctuary of Melchiſedek,' than 'order of Melchiſedek.'

Further, there are ſeveral paſſages in this Epiſtle, which, as worded in the Greek, appear to be inaccurate; but, as ſoon as they are repreſented in Hebrew, we perceive, that the inaccuracy is only in the tranſlation. I have already mentioned examples in my Notes to ch. iii. 3, 4. vi. 19. ix. 4. With reſpect to the laſt inſtance in particular, the paſſage, as worded in the Greek, implies, that the golden pot of manna, and Aaron's rod were kept in the ark of the covenant, which directly contradicts what is related in the books of Moſes, and of the Kings. Now a miſtake of this kind could hardly have been committed by the author of ſo excellent an Epiſtle, as that to the Hebrews: but it might have been made by a tranſlator, who was leſs acquainted with Jewiſh cuſtoms, and it took its riſe perhaps in the following manner. In the place where εν ᾗ is uſed in the Greek, אשר בו was probably uſed in the Hebrew original, which may be conſtrued either with 'holy of holies' (in Hebrew קדש הקדשים) ver. 3. or with 'ark of the covenant' (in Hebrew ארון) ver. 4. The author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews intended to refer to the former: for the golden pot of incenſe, and the rod of Aaron, were really kept in the holy

[g] See my Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr. p. 390, 391.

holy of holies, but not in the ark of the covenant. The tranſlator therefore ſhould have rendered the Hebrew relative by εν οις, in reference to αγια αγιων: inſtead of which he falſely referred it to 'ark of the covenant,' which being in Greek κιβωτος, he tranſlated it by εν η. More examples of this kind will be given in the thirteenth ſection of this chapter; but before I conclude the preſent, I will mention two of a different deſcription.

In ch. ix. 11. immediately after σκηνης, ε χειροποιητε, is added τουτεστιν, ε ταυτης της κτισεως. Here the word χειροποιητος is ſo very intelligible, that it needs no explanation, and the words ε ταυτης της κτισεως, which are given as the explanation of it, are by no means ſo intelligible, as the term to be explained. Now it is very unuſual for an author to explain a ſelf-evident term, and ſtill more unuſual to explain it by one, that is obſcure: but a tranſlator may poſſibly make uſe of words, which in the language, into which he tranſlates, have a contrary effect to that in the original, and repreſent the term to be explained more intelligibly than the explanation itſelf. Hence we may infer that the Greek did not proceed from the author but from a tranſlator. Perhaps, where χειροποιητος ſtands in the Greek, the author had uſed either the Hebrew לא בידים, or the Chaldee לא בידין: and the explanation, which was added, was probably clearer, than that which is given in the Greek.

Again, if the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written in Greek, and conſequently the words quoted from the Septuagint were quoted by the author himſelf, it is very extraordinary, that in the eleventh chapter, where he quotes from the Old Teſtament ſo many examples of faith, he ſhould have omitted to have mentioned in ver. 4, 5. between Abel and Enoch, the name of Enoſh, of whom it is ſaid in the Septuagint, Gen. iv. 26. Ουτος ηλπισεν επικαλεισθαι το ονομα Κυριε τε Θεε, words, which are ſo obviouſly to the writer's purpoſe[h]. On the

[h] Philo has twice made uſe of this paſſage, in deſcribing the hope, which we ought to place in the Supreme Being. The firſt inſtance is in

the other hand, if we assume a Hebrew original of this Epistle, the cause of this omission is easily assigned: for the Hebrew text in Gen. iv. 26. at least in the copies, which are now extant, expresses a different meaning from the text of the Septuagint. It may be said however, in answer to this argument, that the author of the Epistle consulted the Hebrew text, and finding that the Greek differed from it, omitted the quotation.

SECT. XII.

Confutation of the arguments alleged in favour of the opinion that it was written in Greek.

THE arguments, which have been alleged to prove that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written originally in Greek, are very numerous, but for the most part

in the book called Abrahan. (T. II. p. 2. ed. Mangey), and is as follows. Επειδη αρχη μετȣσιας αγαθων εςιν ελπις, και ταυτην, ὁια λεωφορον ὁδον, ἡ φιλαρετος αναφαινει και ανοιγει ψυχη, σπȣδαζȣσα τυχειν τȣ προς αληθειαν καλȣ, τον πρωτον ελπιδος εραςην προσειπεν ανθρωπον, το κοινον τȣ γενȣς ονομα δωρησαμενος αυτῳ, Χαλδαιοι γαρ τον ανθρωπον Ενως καλȣσιν· ὡς μονȣ οντος κατ' αληθειαν ανθρωπȣ, τȣ τα αγαθα προσδοκωντος, και ελπισι χρωςαις εφιδρυμενου. Εξ ȣ δηλον, ὁτι τον δυσελπιν ȣδ' ανθρωπον, αλλ' ανθρωποειδες ἡγειται θηριον, το οικειοτατον ανθρωπινης ψυχης, ελπιδα, αφηρημενον. Ὁθεν και παγκαλως ὑμνησαι βȣλομενος τον ευελπιν, προειπων, ΟΥΤΟΣ ΗΛΠΙΣΕΝ επι τον των ὁλων πατερα και ποιητην, επελεγεν· αὑτη ἡ βιβλος γενεσεως ανθρωπων, καιτοι πατερων και παππων ηδη γεγονοτων.

The other place is in the book of rewards and punishments (T. II. p. 410. ed Mangey), where Philo, after having spoken of hope in general, and the abuse of it, proceeds as follows. Ὑπαιτιοι δε παντες οὑτοι, μονος δε αποδοχης αξιος ὁ αναθεις την ελπιδα θεῳ, ὡς αιτιῳ της γενεσεως αυτης, και ὡς ασινη και αδιαφθορον ἱκανῳ μονῳ διαφυλαξαι. Τι ȣν αθλον προκειται τῳ ςεφανωθεντι τον αγωνα τȣτον; Το μικτον εκ θνητης και αθανατȣ φυσεως ζωον, ὁ ανθρωπος. Τȣτον Χαλδαιοι μεν προσονομαζȣσιν Ενως, ὁς εις Ελλαδα γλωτταν μεταληφθεις εςιν Ανθρωπος, το κοινον ονομα τȣ γενȣς ιδιον λαβων· αθλον εξαιρετον, ὡς δεον μηδενα νομιζεσθαι το παραπαν ανθρωπον. ὁς αν μη επι θεον ελπιζη. Immediately after Philo mentions Enoch, whom the author of the Epistle to Hebrews, ver. 5. of the Chapter in question, has quoted as an instance of faith. It is true that the author of this Epistle would have not made such mystical use of Gen. iv. 26. as Philo has done: but if he had quoted from the Septuagint, he would hardly have passed it over in silence.

part extremely weak. Indeed the moſt learned advocates in favour of this opinion, eſpecially Carpzov, have granted that many of them prove nothing.

1. The moſt ſpecious argument is that, which is founded on διαθηκη, as uſed in ch. ix. 16. 17. This word admits of two ſenſes, and may denote either 'Covenant,' or 'Teſtament.' In the former ſenſe it corresponds to the Hebrew ברית, but not in the latter, for this Hebrew word never ſignifies 'Teſtament.' The author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews has ſometimes uſed διαθηκη in the ſenſe of 'Covenant,' in the ſame manner as Moſes, whom he quotes, had uſed ברית: but in ch. ix. 16. 17. διαθηκη neceſſarily ſignifies 'Teſtament,' that is, a deed which operates only after the death of the maker: for the author of this Epiſtle ſays in the quoted paſſage, Ὁπου γαρ διαθηκη, θανατον αναγκη φερεσθαι τȣ διαθεμενȣ. This application, it is ſaid, could not have taken place in Hebrew, becauſe ברית does not admit of this ſenſe, and could have taken place only in the Greek, in which διαθηκη admits of a two-fold meaning. Conſequently the Epiſtle was written in Greek.

Anſwer. This argument, if it proves any thing, will prove that the Epiſtle was not inſpired: for it implies that the author of it has reaſoned ſophiſtically, and argued not from things, but from the double meaning of a word. In fact, whether the author of this Epiſtle was inſpired or not, I find ſuch excellent arguments in general uſed by him, that I cannot ſuppoſe he would any where have recourſe to the arts of ſophiſtry. I would transfer the charge therefore to a tranſlator, who perhaps made a miſtake in theſe two verſes: and I think it not improbable that the original conveyed a different ſenſe, namely, 'that the death and blood of offered animals were requiſite for the formal confirmation of a covenant.'

At any rate the argument will not prove that the Epiſtle was written in Greek: for the word διαθηκη was adopted both by the Syrians and the Rabbins. In Syriac, it was written ܩܝܡܐ, and uſed both in the ſenſe of

'Covenant' and that of 'Teſtament,' as Caſtell and Schaaf have clearly ſhewn from many paſſages of the Syriac verſion. In the Talmud it is written דיתיקי, where it is likewiſe uſed in both theſe ſenſes, as may be ſeen in Buxtorf's Lex. Talm. p. 534. Mr. Niedel, in a Theſis entitled, Quod Græce epiſtolam ad Hebræos Paulus ſcripſerit, on which he publickly diſputed under Dr. Semler, has ſaid p. 24. in reply to this anſwer, that though the word διαθηκη was adopted in the Syriac, ſtill it remains to be proved, that this word had been already adopted, when the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written, which cannot be inferred from its uſe among the Syrian Chriſtians, becauſe they may have borrowed it, as they did many other words, from the Greek Teſtament. Now the proof, which Mr. Niedel requires, it is wholly impoſſible to give, for the works of no Syriac heathen writer, who lived in the firſt century, are now extant: and therefore ܩܝܡܐ can be quoted from none. But whoever is acquainted with the Syriac language, knows that it contains a conſiderable number of Greek words, which do not exiſt in the Greek Teſtament, and which were introduced into the Syriac, after the time of Alexander, during the reigns of the Macedonian kings of Syria. But even if it were certain, that the word in queſtion did not exiſt in Syriac in the firſt century, and the Syrian writers borrowed it from the New Teſtament, ſtill its introduction in the Talmud cannot be aſcribed to the ſame cauſe, ſince no one will aſſert, that the Talmudiſts derived their terms from the writings of the Chriſtians. More may be ſeen on this ſubject in my Explanation of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, p. 51—53.

2. The Hebrew name Μελχισεδεκ is interpreted, Heb. vii. 2. by the Greek words βασιλευς δικαιοσυνης, and the Hebrew word Σαλημ by ειρηνη. Now, if the Epiſtle had been written in Hebrew, the interpretation of a Hebrew word would have been wholly ſuperfluous: and a tranſlator would hardly have added of his own authority, πρωτον μεν ἑρμηνευομενον βασιλευς δικαιοσυνης, and ὁ ἐστι βασιλευς ειρηνης.

Anſwer.

Anſwer. I can ſee no reaſon, why a tranſlator ſhould not have added this interpretation. I myſelf have taken a ſimilar liberty in my tranſlation of the Hebrew Bible, and have rendered Iſaiah vii. 14. 'A virgin ſhall conceive and bear a ſon, and ſhall call his name Immanuel (that is, God with us).' Nor is it true, that an explanation of Melchiſedek and of Salem would have been ſuperfluous in the Hebrew: for Melchiſedek is written מלכיצדק, whereas 'King of juſtice.' is מֶלֶךְ צֶדֶק, or מֶלֶךְ צְדָקָה, and Salem is written שָׁלֵם, whereas 'Peace' is שָׁלוֹם. In Syriac and Chaldee the difference is ſtill greater [1].

3. A third argument, which has been alleged in favour of a Greek original, but not admitted by Carpzov, is, that in ch. v. 8. 14. vii. 3. 19. ix. 10. x. 34. xi. 37. xiii. 40. are inſtances of the figure, called Paronomaſia. Hence, it is ſaid, the Greek muſt be the original, becauſe it is not eaſy in a tranſlation to retain a Paronomaſia.

Anſwer. The exiſtence of a Paronomaſia in any work is no proof of its being an original, for examples of this kind may take place in a tranſlation, where there are none in the language, from which the tranſlation was made. Nor is it true, that a Paronomaſia in an original is incapable of being transferred into a tranſlation; for it ſometimes happens, that more than one language admits of a play of words on the very ſame ſubject. I remember that I once tranſlated, and that too without deſigning to retain the paronomaſia, the Hebrew words אפר תחת פאר, Iſaiah lxi. 3. by 'cidaris pro cinere:' and Luther's German tranſlation of Iſaiah vii. 9. 'gläubet ihr nicht ſo bleibet ihr nicht' preſerves likewiſe the paronomaſia of the original, אם לא תאמינו כי לא תאמנו, which Luther probably imitated by deſign. But whether they are imitations of the original or not, inſtances of this kind occur ſo frequently in tranſlations, that they cannot

[1] See p. 53. 54. of my Diſſertation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

poſſibly warrant the inference, which has been drawn from them. In my Diſſertation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, p. 60. 62. 63. I have filled more than two whole pages with examples taken merely from tranſlations, to which I now add a few more, which have ſince occurred to me. In Jeremiah vii. 32. the Greek tranſlation in the Septuagint is, θαψεσιν εν τω Ταφεθ, which has given birth to the falſe reading, θαψεσιν εν τω ταφω. In the very firſt verſe of the Epiſtle, with which we are now concerned, the Syriac verſion has the following paronomaſia ܒܟܠܗ ܕܒܟܠ ܒܟܠ, where the Greek is πολυμερως και πολυτροπως. The ſame argument therefore, which is uſed to prove a Greek original, may be applied with equal force in favour of a Syriac original. Again, in Galat. vi. 9. the Syriac verſion has ܠܐ ܢܬܟܠ ܠܐ ܢܬܟܠ, where the Greek is μη εκκακωμεν, and ܠܐ ܢܬܟܠ ܠܐ ܢܬܟܠ, where the Greek is μη εκλυομενοι; and ver. 16. of the ſame chapter, where the Greek, ὁσοι τω κανονι τουτω στοιχησουσιν, ειρηνη επ' αυτους, is likewiſe without any traces of a paronomaſia, the Syriac has the following very remarkable one, ܠܟܠ ܕܢܬܟܠ ܒܟܠ ܒܟܠ ܕܢܬܟܠ ܠܟܠ. In the Old Teſtament likewiſe, the Syriac verſion, in Jerem. xlviii. 36. has ܥܠ ܟܠ ܕܥܒܕ ܥܠ, and the Hexaplar Syriac verſion, in Jerem. xlix. 33. ܠܐ ܢܬܟܠ ܒܗ ܐܦ ܠܐ ܢܬܟܠ ܒܟܠ, where the Greek, εσαι η αυλη διατριβη σρυθων, has no paronomaſia whatſoever.

Beſides, the examples, which have been quoted from the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, are for the moſt part inſtances, not of ſtudied, but of unavoidable ſimilarity of ſound[k]; and that which is taken from ch. xi. 37. is founded on a reading, the authenticity of which is not certain. One example, I grant, is an inſtance of a real paronomaſia, and that too, a paronomaſia in common uſe among the Greeks[l]. Namely, when they intended to ſay, that we learn from adverſity, they ſaid proverbially παθηματα μαθηματα. Now in Heb. v. 8. we find εμαθεν, αφ' ων επαθε την υπακοην. But admitting that the author of

[k] See my Diſſertation on the Ep. to the Hebrews, p. 63—65.

[l] See Carpzov on this paſſage.

of the Epiſtle had the Greek proverb in view, when he wrote this paſſage, it does not neceſſarily follow that the paſſage itſelf was originally Greek: for a proverbial expreſſion in one language may occur to an author, when he is writing in another. It is likewiſe very poſſible, that a perſon, who wrote in Hebrew, might have the ſame thought, without any knowledge of the Greek proverb, and the circumſtance therefore, that the tranſlation contained a paronomaſia, might be matter of mere accident: in the ſame manner as the Latin 'docendo diſco' is, when tranſlated into German a real paronomaſia, 'durch lehren lerne ich.'

4. It is ſaid, that if the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written originally in Hebrew, it is very extraordinary, that the original ſo ſuddenly diſappeared, that no eccleſiaſtical writer, even of the third or fourth century, ever ſaw a copy of it. This argument I will ſtill ſtrengthen by adding: What is the reaſon likewiſe, that the Nazarenes and the Ebionites, who made uſe of the Hebrew Goſpel of St. Matthew, are not mentioned either by Jerom or Epiphanius, as having had a copy of the Hebrew Epiſtle to the Hebrews: and, what muſt appear ſtill more extraordinary, why did the author of the Syriac verſion tranſlate this Epiſtle from the Greek, if its original was Hebrew.

Anſwer. We cannot argue from the non-exiſtence of a book in the third or fourth century to its non-exiſtence in the firſt. It cannot be denied, that of the numerous works of antiquity, many had only a ſhort duration: and of the early extinction of a Hebrew Epiſtle to the Hebrews it is by no means difficult to aſſign the cauſe. The Greek tranſlation, which muſt have been made at a very early age, ſupplied the place of the original, which was unintelligible, except to the Chriſtians of Paleſtine. But the Jewiſh war, and the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, obliged a greater part of the Chriſtians in that country, to ſeek a ſettlement in other places, where they gradually intermixed with the natives, and of courſe adopted their language. The Nazarenes and the Ebionites, who remained in Paleſtine, and conſequently

ſequently retained their native language, were the only perſons therefore who can be ſuppoſed to have uſed a Hebrew Epiſtle. But it is well known that they were declared enemies, both of St. Paul, and of his writings. If then St. Paul was the author of the Epiſtle, it is not extraordinary that they rejected it. On the other hand, if he was not the author, and the Epiſtle proceeded from a perſon unknown, its early loſs can afford to no man juſt matter of ſurpriſe.

5. A fifth argument in favour of a Greek original, is, that the quotations in this Epiſtle from the Old Teſtament, are made in the words of the Septuagint.

Anſwer. This may be aſcribed to a tranſlator, as eaſily as to the author. And that we ought rather to aſcribe this circumſtance to a tranſlator, appears from what I have already ſaid in the former part of this ſection, where I have ſhewn, that the paſſages, quoted in the words of the ſeptuagint, are ſometimes leſs ſuitable to the purpoſe, for which they were produced, than they would have been, if quoted, as they are worded in the Hebrew.

6. This Epiſtle is more free from Hebraiſms, than moſt other books of the New Teſtament, which would hardly have happened, had it been a tranſlation of a Hebrew original.

Anſwer. It is ſurely poſſible for a tranſlator, who is maſter of the language, in which he writes, to produce a tranſlation which bears no marks of the language, from which it was made. Beſides, the Epiſtle to the Hebrews is not abſolutely free from Hebraiſms, of which I ſhall give examples in the following ſection. Nay, the very perſons, who have made uſe of the argument in queſtion, have at other times, not only granted that there are Hebraiſms, but even appealed to them, and compared them with the Hebraiſms in St. Paul's Epiſtles, in order to prove that he was the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

To the preceding arguments, Mr. Neidel in the theſis quoted at the beginning of this ſection has added the following[m].

7. The

[m] See my Explanation of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, p. 65—71.

7. The Epistle to the Hebrews contains many allegorical interpretations, such as were in use among the Hellenist Jews, and are found in the writings of Philo: whereas allegories of this kind were not adopted by the Rabbins, who wrote in Hebrew, the Hebrew language being too poor to admit of them.

Answer. The Hebrew writings of the Rabbins are so far from being devoid of allegorical interpretations, that they abound with them, as every one knows, who has read these writings. They are even so remarkable, that they have been distinguished by a peculiar title, namely, that of Medrash: and moreover St. Paul has been accused of imitating this Rabbinical mode of interpretation. To the assertion, that the Hebrew language is too poor to have expressed what is contained in the Greek Epistle to the Hebrews, I answer, this Epistle has been translated into very good and fluent Syriac: and nothing would be more easy, than to translate it into the Rabbinic and Talmudic dialects. This objection therefore proceeded from a want of sufficient information on the subject.

8. The quotation made in ch. i. 7. ὁ ποιων τȣς αγγελȣς αὐτȣ πνευματα, cannot be expressed in Hebrew.

Answer. The words here quoted are taken from Psalm civ. 4. I admit indeed, with Mr. Neidel, that the Hebrew text in this passage signifies, 'he maketh the winds his messengers:' but I do not admit that this is the only sense, of which it is capable, for רוח may be taken in the sense of 'spirit,' and מלאך in that of 'angel,' as the author of the Septuagint version of the Psalms really has translated these words.

9. The word 'anchor' occurs ch. vi, 19. a term, which is hardly to be expected in a Hebrew work, as the Jews were not a sea-faring nation.

Answer. The Syriac, which in the main agrees with the Chaldee, has several names for an anchor, among which the author of the Syriac version has chosen in this instance ܐܘܣܝܢܐ: and in the Talmud it is denoted by עוגן or חוגן. Nor is it true that the Jews were wholly unacquainted

unacquainted with shipping: for, to say nothing of the age of Solomon, the city of Joppa was made a harbour by the high priest Simon[n], and Cæsarea by Herod[o]. The Jews committed even piracy in the Mediterranean, in the time of Pompey.

10. The word θεατριζομενοι, ch. x. 33. has a manifest allusion to Greek customs, and the notion conveyed by it cannot be expressed in Hebrew, because theatres were not permitted among the Jews.

Answer. Though theatres were inconsistent with the Jewish customs, yet the Jews were not wholly unacquainted with them: and Herod even built a theatre both at Jerusalem[p], and at Cæsarea[q]. The Greek word θεατρον was adopted in the Syriac, Chaldee, and Talmudic, and written, ܬܐܛܪܘܢ, תיאטרון, אתיטרון, as may be seen on consulting Buxtorf and Schaaf. In the present instance however the Syriac translator has used a pure Syriac word and written ܚܙܘܢܐ.

SECT. XIII.

Examination of the question, whether the Greek Epistle to the Hebrews is in all respects an accurate translation of the original.

AS the Greek Epistle to the Hebrews is only a translation, it proceeded from a person, who was not infallible, and was consequently exposed to the danger of mistaking the sense of his author. It is necessary therefore, as far as can be done without a comparison with the original, to examine whether the translation be every where free from error. That the translator has executed

[n] 1 Maccab. xiv. 5.

[o] Joseph. Antiq. xv. 9. 6.

[p] Joseph. Antiq. xv. 8. 1.

[q] Ib. xv. 9. 6.

executed his taſk with ability, muſt be obvious to every one who underſtands Greek: for, in general, his language is perſpicuous, his ſentences are well-arranged, and the Epiſtle is more eaſy to be underſtood, than any of thoſe, which were written by St. Paul. Yet I think ſome few exceptions muſt be made, where the tranſlator appears to have rendered inaccurately. The following are examples of this kind.

Ch. i. 2. δι ὑ και τυς αιωνας εποιησε. Here the expreſſion τυς αιωνας, which again occurs in the ſame ſenſe, ch. xi. 3. is, I think, exceptionable. Οἱ αιωνες is conſtantly uſed by the Greek writers as a word expreſſive of time, or as denoting a ſucceſſion of ages: but in the preſent inſtance the context requires for it a different ſenſe, namely that of 'worlds.' Now the Jews uſed their עולם in both ſenſes; for though it literally denotes 'ſæculum,' yet they frequently applied it in the ſenſe of 'mundus.' For inſtance, they called the Earth עולם השפל, that is, the lower world; to the middle regions they gave the name of עולם דתיכן, and the upper regions, or the heavens, they denoted by עולם דעלין[r]. It is therefore not improbable, that where τυς αιωνας ſtands in the tranſlation, the Hebrew word עולמים was uſed, by which the author intended to expreſs the notion of 'worlds.' But as it ſignifies at other times 'ages,' this ſenſe ſuggeſted itſelf to the tranſlator, which induced him to render it, and that too improperly in the preſent inſtance, by τυς αιωνας: for in no other inſtance, either in the New Teſtament, or in the Septuagint is this word uſed in the ſenſe of 'worlds.' If we reject the opinion that the Epiſtle was written in Hebrew, it will be almoſt impoſſible to give a ſatisfactory explanation of this ſingular uſe of οἱ αιωνες.

Ch. ii. 1. δια τυτο δει περισσοτερως ἡμας προσεχειν τοις ακουσθεισι, μη ποτε παραρρυωμεν. Here μη ποτε παραρρυη ſcil,

[r] See Buxtorf Lex. Talm. p. 1620.

scil. τα ακουσθεντα, ne effluant audita a nobis, would agree much better with the context than μη ποτε παραρρυωμεν, which all the commentators have found it difficult to explain. Perhaps, this is another instance of inaccuracy in the translator: and if the original was not pure Hebrew, but Syriac, the cause of the mistake may be very easily assigned. In Syriac, the verb has the same form in the first person plural, as in the third person singular: and in this very example, the Syriac version has ܕܠܐ ܢܦܠܐ, which denotes both μη ποτε παραρρυωμεν and μη ποτε παραρρυῃ.

Ch. ii. 9. ὁπως χαριτι θεου ὑπερ παντος γευσηται θανατου. Instead of χαριτι θεου, some authorities have χωρις θεου. It is true that this variation might easily take place by mere accident in a Greek manuscript: but when I wrote the note to this verse in my Commentary on the Epistle I ventured the conjecture that both of these readings were translations from the Hebrew. For בהסד signifies χαριτι, and בחסר, which differs only in the turn of a letter denotes χωρις. At present, this conjecture appears to me to be less probable, than it did formerly: I note it however as a subject for future inquiry.

Ch. iii. 3. 4. as worded in the Greek gives a sense, which could hardly have been meant by a writer so rational, as the author of this Epistle: but as soon as we represent the passage in Hebrew the difficulty vanishes. It is probable, that where ὁ κατασκευασας αυτον stands in the Greek, בנו was used in the original, which according to the design of the author should have been pronounced בְּנוֹ and translated ὁ υἱος αυτου: but the translator pronounced it בֹּנוֹ, and accordingly rendered it ὁ κατασκευασας αυτον. The reader will find a further illustration of this example in my Note to the passage.

Ch. v. 13. πας γαρ ὁ μετεχων γαλακτος, απειρος, λογου δικαιοσυνης, νηπιος γαρ εστι, is extremely harsh and obscure. In the 10th verse, the subject related to the 'Priest after the order of Melchisedek,' in Hebrew, על דברתי מלכיצדק, after which the author argues thus: 'of whom I have much to say, but ye are at present not sufficiently

advanced to comprehend it; ye are ſtill children, for whoever partakes of milk, &c.' When I conſider therefore the whole of the author's argumentation, I think it probable that where the tranſlator has uſed λογε δικαιοσυνης, the author had uſed דבר צדק, which ought to have been pronounced דִּבֻּר צֶדֶק, and taken in the ſenſe of 'the true place of holineſs.' Or perhaps he wrote דבר מלכיצדק, ſignifying 'the doctrine of Melchiſedek:' and that copy of the original, which fell into the hands of the tranſlator, was in this paſſage defective.

Ch. vi. 4. γευσαμενους της δωρεας της επουρανιε, appears to relate to the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper. Perhaps מָן הַשָּׁמַיִם was uſed in the original, by which the author meant to expreſs 'the heavenly manna,' a meaning well ſuited to the context. But the tranſlator took מן in the ſenſe of 'gift[a],' and rendered it, improperly in the preſent inſtance, by δωρεα. Compare my Note to this paſſage with John vi. 31—35.

Ch. vi. 19, 20. Ην (ſcil. ελπιδα) ως αγκυραν εχομεν της ψυχης ασφαλη τε και βεβαιαν, και εισερχομενην εις το εσωτερον τε καταπετασματος, οπε προδρομος υπερ ημων εισηλθεν Ιησους. Here hope is compared with an anchor, and this anchor is ſaid to have entered into the holy of holies, where Chriſt our forerunner had entered before. This incongruity of metaphor could hardly have proceeded from the author of the Epiſtle. I ſuſpect therefore that αγκυραν is an inaccurate tranſlation. See my Note to this paſſage.

Ch. vii. 14. προδηλον γαρ, οτι εξ Ιουδα ανατεταλκεν ο κυριος ημων. Now it is certainly true, that our Lord was of the tribe of Juda: yet, when I conſider this paſſage in its connexion with the reſt of the chapter, which contains a commentary on Pſalm cx. 4. I think it probable that the author intended to argue thus: 'It is manifeſt that *the* Lord (namely he, to whom the ſubject relates, Pſ. cx. 1. 5.) muſt be of the tribe of Juda, as being a deſcendant of David. The prieſthood of Melchiſedek was evidently promiſed

[a] In Arabic مَنّ ſignifies donavit.

promiſed to one of the tribe of Juda, not of the tribe of Levi.' A ſimilar miſtake appears to have been made in regard to the tranſlation of the Hebrew, Pſ. cx. 1. נאם יהוה לאדני, where לאדני ought, in my opinion, to be pointed לַאדֹנִי, as it is in the Caſſel manuſcript. The Hebrew will then ſignify, 'Jehovà ſaid to *the* Lord, (that is, to the Lord of the univerſe). But the author of the Septuagint verſion of the Pſalms pointed and pronounced לַאדנִי, which ſignifies to *my* Lord, and rendered the paſſage, *ειπεν ὁ κυριος τῳ κυριῳ μȣ.* See p. 477—482. of my critical lecture on this Pſalm.

Ch. ix. 2, 3, 4. Of this paſſage I have already ſpoken in the 11th ſection of this chapter. The reader may likewiſe conſult my note to it, in the Expoſition of this Epiſtle.

Ch. ix. 14, 15, 16, 17. Of this paſſage I have ſpoken at the beginning of the preceding ſection. According to the Greek text, the mode of arguing is ſo very extraordinary, that I cannot aſcribe it to a writer, ſo rational, as the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, I conclude therefore, that the tranſlator has made a miſtake.

Ch. ix. 19. As this verſe is worded in the Greek, Moſes is ſaid to have ſprinkled with blood, both the book of the law, and the children of Iſrael. But it is a miſtake, that the book of the law was ſprinkled with blood. I conclude therefore, that this verſe conveyed a different meaning in the original, and that the ſenſe expreſſed by the author was, 'he took blood mixed with water, ſcarlet wool, and hyſſop, with the book of the law, and ſprinkled all the people:' and not as the Greek tranſlation expreſſes, 'he ſprinkled both the book and all the people.'

Ch. x. 1. *Σκιαν γαρ εχων ὁ νομος των μελλοντων αγαθων, ȣκ αυτην την εικονα, των πραγματων.* Here the antitheſis requires in the latter clauſe a word expreſſive of 'ſubſtance' in oppoſition to *σκια*, ſhadow. But *εικων* does not admit of this ſenſe, and *ȣκ αυτην την εικονα* can be conſtrued only,

only, 'not the image itſelf,' which is unſuitable to the context. This is an inaccuracy, which can be only aſcribed to the tranſlator: and it is not difficult to aſſign the cauſe, which led him into error. The Latin *ipſe* was expreſſed in the Oriental languages by a noun-ſubſtantive[t]. The Arabs, for inſtance, among other nouns uſed for this purpoſe صُورَةٌ, which literally ſignifies forma, imago. Now if a ſimilar term was uſed in this paſſage by the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, the tranſlator might literally render it by εικων, without conſidering, that the word in the original was there uſed in a ſenſe, of which the Greek word was incapable. The Hebrew word תמונה uſed in Numb. xii. 8. Pſalm xvii. 15. which literally ſignifies, forma, imago, admits, perhaps the ſame application as the Arabic صُورَةٌ: and תמנת יהוה יביט, Numb. xii. 8. may be rendered not only, 'he ſhall ſee the image of Jehova,' but 'he ſhall ſee Jehova himſelf.' It is therefore not impoſſible that תמונה was uſed in Heb. x. 1. and that this was the word, which gave riſe to the tranſlation εικων. A leſs improper tranſlation, at leaſt in this place, would have been δοξα, which the lxx have uſed for תמונה both in Numb. xii. 8. and Pſalm xvii. 15: for απ αυτην την δοξαν would have formed a much better antitheſis to σκιαν, than εικονα.

Ch. xi. 35. ελαβον γυναικες εξ αναστασεως τους νεκρους αυτων. Here the Syriac verſion ܩܒܠܘ ܢܫܐ ܡܢ ܩܝܡܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܝܗܘܢ, that is, 'they reſtored to women their ſons from the reſurrection of the dead.' This would be in Greek, with exception to the verb, on which I will not hazard a conjecture,—γυναικας εξ αναστασεως νεκρων τους αυτων (ſcil. υιους). Now one part of this reading, namely γυναικας, is really found in the Alexandrine and Clermont manuſcripts. The meaning, which the paſſage there conveys, I will not now examine; but perhaps it is ſomething to this

[t] See my Arabic Grammar § 66. p. 213. and my Syriac Grammar § 91. p. 215.

this purpoſe, 'they married again, after they were riſen from the dead.' At any rate however I think that γυναικας is a remnant of the old reading preſerved in the Syriac verſion. But the difficulty is, to find a Greek verb, which could be uſed before γυναικας in the accuſative, and at the ſame time was capable of being conſtrued with γυναικες in the nominative. The common reading ελαβον will not ſuit this two-fold purpoſe, unleſs the paſſage ſignifies, that perſons married, who had ariſen from the dead. Now that examples of this kind took place I will not deny: but there are none on record among the inſtances of faith, which are quoted in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews from the Old Teſtament. Be this as it will, γυναικας in the accuſative gives a ſenſe in this paſſage ſo very different from that of γυναικες in the nominative, that I cannot ſuppoſe it had its origin merely as a various reading in the Greek: and I think it therefore not improbable, that they are different tranſlations of the Hebrew text, and that the one was intended as a correction of, or an improvement on, the other. The Hebrew verb לקח, which ſignifies properly cepit, has been taken in the ſenſe of dedit: and in Pſalm lxviii. 19. this ſame verb has been tranſlated both ways[a]. It is therefore not improbable that the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews uſed לקחו, which was capable of being rendered either by ελαβον the common Greek reading, or by εδωκαν the reading expreſſed in the Syriac verſion.

Ch. xii. 15. μη τις ριζα πικριας ανω φυουσα ενοχλη, και δια ταυτης μιανθωσι πολλοι. Here is a notion expreſſed, which is wholly inconſiſtent with the Jewiſh mode of thinking. According to the laws of Moſes various meats were unclean, and defiled thoſe, who ate them; but no herbs, not even thoſe which were poiſonous, were conſidered as polluting thoſe, who partook of them. The original therefore muſt have conveyed a different ſenſe, but what that ſenſe was, it is difficult to determine.

[a] See the Supplem. ad Lexica Hebraica.

determine. But, if I may be allowed to form a conjecture on the paſſage in Deuteronomy[w], to which alluſion is here made, I think it not impoſſible, that the words uſed in the original were ויספו רבים 'et addantur multi.' Now in Arabic سواف ſignifies an infectious diſeaſe, and therefore a tranſlator might eaſily miſtake the meaning of the Hebrew verb, and render theſe words by και μιανθωσι πολλοι, uſing μιαινω, not in the Moſaic ſenſe of defiling by unclean meats, but in a medical ſenſe. However, this is a conjecture, on which I will not inſiſt; but whatever was the cauſe of the miſtake, μιαινω is at any rate an inaccurate tranſlation.

Ch. xii. 18. ε γαρ προσεληλυθατε ψηλαφωμενῳ ορει. ver. 22. αλλα προσεληλυθατε Σιων ορει. Here the expreſſion ορει ψηλαφωμενῳ, monti palpabili, which is oppoſed to Σιων ορει is certainly a very extraordinary one: and I am wholly unable to give a ſatisfactory account of it, except on the ſuppoſition, that the Epiſtle was written in Hebrew. But on this ſuppoſition the cauſe of the inaccuracy may be eaſily aſſigned. Sinai, or the mountain of Moſes, is that, which is here oppoſed to mount Sion. Now the expreſſion 'to the mountain of Moſes' is in Hebrew לְהַר מֹשֶׁה. The word מֹשֶׁה the tranſlator miſunderſtood, and inſtead of reading it מֹשֶׁה and taking it for a proper name, either read by miſtake מש palpatio, or pronounced by miſtake מִשָּׁה palpatio. Hence, inſtead of rendering 'to the mountain of Moſes,' he rendered 'to the tangible mountain.'

Heb. xii. 25. Βλεπετε, μη παραιτησησθε τον λαλουντα· ει γαρ εκεινοι ουκ εφυγον τον επι της γης παραιτησαμενοι χρηματιζοντα, πολλῳ μαλλον ημεις οι τον απ' ουρανων αποστρεφομενοι. On the difficulties attending the word παραιτησαμενοι in this paſſage, I have ſpoken at large in my Commentary on the Epiſtle, to which I refer the reader, eſpecially to p. 407.

Ch. xxix. 18, 19.

p. 407. It has ſince occurred to me, that παραιτησαμενοι, which I conſider as incorrect, may be explained as a fault of the tranſlator. Where the Greek words του επι της γης παραιτησαμενοι χρηματιζοντα are uſed, the Hebrew original was perhaps to the following purport, 'die ſich den von der Erde redenden *erbaten, und den vom Himmel* verbaten;' and the words, which I have printed in Italics, were either overlooked by the tranſlator, or had been omitted by accident in the copy, from which he tranſlated.

Ch. xiii. 9. Βεβαιουσθαι την καρδιαν appears to be a too literal and conſequently obſcure tranſlation of לב מעד, which, literally taken, ſignifies 'to ſtrengthen the heart,' but is uſed as denoting 'to invigorate the body by food,' or 'to partake of a meal,' as in Judges xix. 5. and Pſalm civ. 15. See the 491ſt Note in my Commentary.

Ch. xiii. 15. See the 501ſt Note.

SECT. XIV.

Remarks on the Greek ſtyle of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

THE Greek ſtyle of this Epiſtle is different from that of every other book of the New Teſtament. It is likewiſe ſuperior to that of every other book [x], with the exception perhaps of the ſpeeches of St. Paul recorded in Acts xvii. 22—31. xxiv. 10—21. xxvi. 1—21. But though the language of theſe ſpeeches is equally good and fluent with that of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, it is ſtill of a very different kind.

Among the peculiarities of the Greek ſtyle of this Epiſtle may be reckoned the particular uſe of certain words.

[x] See the words of Origen quoted above, in the 10th ſection of this chapter.

words. For inſtance, the appellation of Αποστολος is given to Chriſt, ch. iii. 1. The uſe of αποστολος in this ſenſe may be aſcribed perhaps to the circumſtance, that it is a tranſlation of the Hebrew word שלוח. For in John ix. 7. שילח appears to be the name of the Meſſiah, in ſupport of which ſenſe Wetſtein in his Note to John ix. 7. has quoted a paſſage from Debarim Rabba: and in the books of the Sabians, Jeſus is ſaid to have called himſelf ܫܠܝܚܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ, that is, 'the firſt Apoſtle.' Νωθροι, ch. v. 11. vi. 12. an elegant Greek word, occurs in no other inſtance in the whole New Teſtament; and in the Septuagint it is uſed only in the Proverbs of Solomon, which are tranſlated into better Greek, than any other part of the Old Teſtament. In the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, νωθροι is probably the tranſlation of כבדי. Ακροθινια, ch. vii. 4. occurs in no other inſtance, either in the New Teſtament, or in the Septuagint. It is here an admirably choſen word, for it literally denotes that part of the ſpoil, which was allotted to the commander. The expreſſion ου γαρ αν δευτερας εζητειτο τοπος, ch. viii. 7. is really elegant Greek.

In quoting paſſages, without mentioning the place, from which they were taken, the tranſlator makes uſe of ſuch terms as were agreeable to the manner of the Greeks: for inſtance, ch. ii. 6. διεμαρτυρατο δε που τις[y], and ch. iv. 4. ειρηκε γαρ που, In the original was probably uſed the common rabbinical expreſſion ואמר, which a tranſlator, leſs acquainted with the Greek mode of writing, would have rendered by και ειπε[z], or και λεγει. Alſo the plural number 'we,' inſtead of the ſingular 'I,' occurs in ch. v. 11. and is continued almoſt throughout the next chapter: it occurs again ch.

[y] Carpzov in his Note to this paſſage obſerves, that Philo often quotes in his manner.

[z] As in Matth. xix. 5. where ειπε can have no other meaning, than 'the ſcripture ſays,' or 'it is thus written.'

ch. x. 15.; and perhaps ch. xiii. 18. may be added as an inſtance of the plural for the ſingular, though in the verſe, which immediately follows, the ſingular is uſed.

Laſtly, the tranſlator has ſeveral favorite words, which diſtinguiſh him from other writers, and occur more frequently in this Epiſtle, than in any other part of the New Teſtament. For inſtance κληρονομος and κληρονομειν, where the ſubject does not relate to inheritance, as in ch. i. 2. 4. 14. xi. 7. Again, κρειττων, in the ſenſe of 'ſuperior,' or 'nobler,' or 'more excellent,' ch. i. 4. vii. 7. 19. 22. viii. 6. ix. 23. xi. 40. xii. 24. On the whole, this word occurs thirteen times in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, though in all the other books of the New Teſtament put together it occurs only ſix times, and is uſed ſimply in the ſenſe of 'better.' Μετεχειν is uſed, ch. ii. 14. vii. 13. to denote relationſhip, or participation of blood or tribe. It is uſed however, ch. v. 13. to denote participation of food, in the ſenſe, in which St. Paul has uſed it, in whoſe Epiſtles, it occurs on the whole five times. To the preceding examples may be added the particular uſe of πειραν λαμβανειν, ch. xi. 29. 36.

Whether the tranſlator had read the works of Philo, with whom he ſometimes agrees in his expreſſions, as in χαρακτηρ, ch. i. 3. I will not undertake to determine. But for the opinion, that the author had ever read Philo, there is no ground whatſoever: ſince their mode of arguing on the ſame ſubject, and on the ſame paſſages of the Old Teſtament, is totally different. It was Philo's object to adapt the doctrines of Moſes to the precepts of Plato, for which purpoſe he interprets his quoted paſſages allegorically, and involves ſimple facts in the moſt profound and often ridiculous myſtery: but the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews does not quote and argue in this manner. And, as the two writers have ſo little connexion with each other, I do not ſee how this Epiſtle can be conſidered even as a confutation of the allegorical dreams of Philo.

Neither

Neither in any other book of the New Teſtament, nor in the works of any Chriſtian writer of the firſt century, is there any reſemblance to the ſtyle of this Epiſtle: it muſt have proceeded therefore from a perſon, of whom we have no other writings now extant.

The notion, that St. Paul dictated the Epiſtle in Hebrew, and that an amanuenſis committed it immediately to writing in Greek, is highly improbable: for in ſuch an haſty tranſlation the words would not have been ſo well choſen, nor the ſentences ſo well arranged.

SECT. XV.

Of the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews: whether it was written by St. Paul: and firſt, of the opinion of the ancients on this ſubject.

THE queſtion, which we have now to examine, is of very great importance, becauſe the canonical authority of this Epiſtle, which will be conſidered in a following ſection, entirely depends upon it.

Hiſtorical evidence, in the ſtrict ſenſe of the word, or conſidered as teſtimony to a matter of fact, we have none on this ſubject: and the opinions of the moſt celebrated eccleſiaſtical writers are ſo far from being uniform, that while ſome received it, others, nay whole churches rejected it, as not being the work of St. Paul.

The moſt ancient writer, who has aſcribed this Epiſtle to St. Paul, but who at the ſame time obviated the objection, derived from the difference of ſtyle, by ſaying, that the Apoſtle wrote it in Hebrew, and that the Greek is only a tranſlation, is Clement of Alexandria, whoſe words are quoted by Euſebius, in his

Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, B. VI. Ch. 14. Now as Clement lived at the end of the ſecond, and at the beginning of the third century, he cannot be conſidered in this inſtance as bearing teſtimony to a matter of fact, which indeed he does not pretend to do. But at the ſame time it muſt be obſerved, that Clement quotes the authority of his maſter Pantænus: for after having delivered his own opinion, he proceeds, as follows. Ηδη δε, ως ὁ μακαριτης ελεγε πρεσβυτερος[a], επει ὁ Κυριος, αποστολος ων τε παντοκρατορος, απεσταλη προς Ἑβραιους, δια μετριοτητα ὁ Παυλος, ως αν εις τα εθνη απεσταλμενος, εκ εγγραφει ἑαυτον Ἑβραιων αποστολον[b], δια τε την προς τον Κυριον ἡμων τιμην, δια τε το εκ περιουσιας τοις Ἑβραιοις επιστελλειν, εθνων κηρυκα ογτα και αποστολον. Pantænus therefore aſcribed the Epiſtle to St. Paul, and endeavoured to account for the omiſſion of the Apoſtle's name at the beginning of it. But this again is rather opinion than teſtimony, ſince Pantænus lived three or four generations later than St. Paul.

Origen, the celebrated ſcholar of Clement, entertained a different opinion on this ſubject, and conſequently muſt have conſidered what was aſſerted by Clement and Pantænus likewiſe as mere opinion, and not as hiſtorical evidence. The words of Origen, which are quoted by Euſebius, in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, B. VI. Ch. 25. are to the following purport. 'In my opinion, the matter was from St. Paul, but the conſtruction of the words from another, who recorded the thoughts of the Apoſtle, and made notes, as it were, of what was ſaid by his maſter.' According to Origen then, the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was not written by St. Paul, in any ſenſe whatſoever, neither in Greek, nor in Hebrew: for in his opinion, the ſentiments only were thoſe of the Apoſtle, but the clothing in which

[a] This is the appellation, by which he generally diſtinguiſhes Pantænus.

[b] See what was ſaid on this ſubject, in the ſecond ſection of this chapter.

which thoſe ſentiments were conveyed, was the work of one of his diſciples, who noted the doctrines, which he had heard delivered by his maſter, and made, as it were, commentaries on them. Now this repreſentation is very conſiſtent with the contents of the Epiſtle itſelf, in which we find a much greater degree of copiouſneſs, than in the compreſſed writings of St. Paul. Further, Origen's words by no means imply, that St. Paul even ordered the Epiſtle to be written: and indeed, if he had, it is probable, that a ſalutation would have been ſent to the Hebrews in his name. Having delivered his own opinion, Origen adds: *ει τις εν εκκλησια εχει παυτην την επιστολην ως Παυλε, αυτη ευδοκομειτω και επι τετω, ε γαρ εικη οι αρχαιοι ανδρες ως Παυλε αυτην παραδεδωκασι. Τις δε ο γραψας την επιστολην, το μεν αληθες Θεος οιδεν· η δε εις ημας φθασασα ιστορια υπο τινων μεν λεγοντων, οτι Κλημης ο γενομενος επισκοπος Ρωμαιων εγραψε την επιστολην, υπο τινων δε οτι Λυκας ο γραψας το ευαγγελιον και τας πραξεις.* From this paſſage it appears, that Origen, though he himſelf did not believe that St. Paul wrote the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, by no means diſapproved of thoſe, who received it as the work of St. Paul, becauſe, as he had ſaid before, the ſentiments were thoſe of the Apoſtle. Of the perſon, who really wrote it, he acknowledges his total ignorance: but he ſays, that of the accounts [c], which had been handed down on this ſubject, ſome aſcribed the compoſition to Clement, biſhop of Rome, and others to St. Luke, the Evangeliſt. But neither of theſe contradictory accounts can be true; for the ſtyle of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews is neither that of St. Luke, nor that of Clement of Rome: and the latter eſpecially, if we may judge from what is now extant of his works, had it not even in his power to write an Epiſtle ſo replete with Jewiſh learning.

It

[c] By *ιστορια εις ημας φθωσασα*, Origen means probably only *oral* accounts, and therefore the tranſlation in the Benedictine edition, 'ſcriptores quorum monumenta ad nos uſque pervenerunt,' is not accurate.

It is true, that Origen has ſometimes quoted this Epiſtle under the title of 'St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Hebrews [d]:' but in ſo doing, he followed only the common cuſtom, and gave the appellation to this Epiſtle, by which it was uſually denoted, without entering into the merits of that appellation. In like manner many modern commentators, who doubt the authenticity of the two firſt chapters of St. Matthew's, and the eleven laſt verſes of St. Mark's Goſpel, ſtill quote them, agreeably to the common practice, under the name of St. Matthew and St. Mark, without ſignifying at the time of quoting, that they entertained doubts in regard to the authors. However it muſt be obſerved, that Origen does not always quote the Epiſtle to the Hebrews under the title of St. Paul's Epiſtle. On the contrary, in his letter to Africanus[e], where he ſpeaks of the hiſtory of Suſanna and Daniel, and obſerves, that many accounts, which are not to be found in the Hebrew Bible, are preſerved by oral tradition, or in apocryphal writings, he appeals[f] to the word επρισθησαν, Heb. xi. 37. as referring to Iſaiah, who, according to the tradition of the Jews, and an apocryphal book, was ſawed aſunder. Here he does not mention St. Paul as the author, but writes, ὑπο της προς Ἑβραιους επιστολης, and ὁ την προς Ἑβραιους γραψας: and afterwards he adds[g], αλλ' εικος τινα θλιβομενων ὑπο της εις ταυτα ὑποδειξεως συγχρησεσθαι τῳ βιβλιῳ των αθετουντων την επιστολην, ὡς ε Παυλε· προς ὃν αλλων λογων κατ' ιδιαν χρῃζομεν, εις αποδειξιν τε ειναι Παυλε την επιστολην. In this paſſage it is evident, that Origen underſtood perſons, who not only denied, that the Epiſtle was written by St. Paul, but rejected it on that account as uncanonical: and that he himſelf conſidered the queſtion as determinable, not from hiſtorical or external evidence, but merely from internal

[d] Theſe examples may be ſeen in Lardner's Credibility, Vol. III. p. 249, 250.

[e] Origen. Op. T. I. p. 12—30. ed. Benedict.

[f] Sect. 9. p. 19. [g] Pag. 20.

internal evidence. What would be the reſult of the inquiry, he has on this occaſion left unnoticed: but from the paſſage, quoted in the former part of this ſection, we ſee, that Origen allowed, that the Epiſtle was St. Paul's only in this ſenſe, that the Apoſtle was the author of the ſentiments contained in it, not that he was the author of the compoſition itſelf.

Such was the uncertain ſtate of the queſtion in the ſecond and third centuries: nor have the following ages produced any new diſcoveries, which might bring it nearer to an abſolute deciſion. It would be uſeleſs to enumerate the fathers of the fourth and ſubſequent centuries, who have quoted this Epiſtle under the name of St. Paul [h]. Their number, let it be ever ſo great, can never decide the queſtion; for if Origen could obtain no certain hiſtorical information in the third century, it cannot be expected from later writers, and conſequently their acceding to the opinion, that St. Paul was the author, can give it no additional weight. Beſides, it is not improbable, that many of them, like Origen, quoted this Epiſtle under the name of St. Paul, without intending to ſignify their full perſuaſion, that St. Paul was the author. Euſebius himſelf, though he aſcribed fourteen Epiſtles to St. Paul, and included therefore the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, is yet ſo candid as to acknowledge, that many in his time rejected it, as not written by the Apoſtle, eſpecially the church of Rome [i]. Now the circumſtance, that the church of Rome did not receive this Epiſtle as a work of St. Paul, is of ſome importance in the preſent inquiry, becauſe moſt commentators, who aſcribe the Epiſtle to St. Paul, contend, that he wrote it in Rome. But an Epiſtle written by St. Paul in Rome could not have remained unknown to the Romans, and therefore their rejection of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews is very unfavour-

[h] Whoever wiſhes to ſee an enumeration of them may conſult Lardner's Supplement, Vol. II. Ch. xii. Sect. 14. § 3.

[i] Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. III. c. 3.

unfavourable to it. At the ſame time it muſt be obſerved, that this argument operates only againſt thoſe, who aſſert, that St. Paul wrote it in Rome, not againſt thoſe, who contend, that he wrote it elſewhere.

Jerom, the moſt learned of all the fathers of the fourth or fifth centuries, has, in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, under the article Paulus, given the following account of this Epiſtle[k]. 'Epiſtola, quæ ad Hebræos fertur, non ejus eſſe creditur, propter ſtyli ſermoniſque diſſonantiam, ſed vel Barnabæ, juxta Tertullianum, vel Lucæ evangeliſtæ, juxta quoſdam, vel Clementis, Romanæ poſtea eccleſiæ epiſcopi, quem aiunt ipſi adjunctum ſententias Pauli proprio ordinaſſe et ornaſſe ſermone. Vel certe, quia Paulus ſcribebat ad Hebræos, et propter invidiam ſui apud eos nominis titulum in principio ſalutationis amputaverat, Scripſerat, ut Hebræus Hebræis, Hebraice, id eſt, ſuo eloquio, diſertiſſime, ut ea, quæ eloquenter ſcripta fuerant in Hebræo, eloquentius verterentur in Græcum: et hanc cauſam eſſe, quod a cæteris Pauli epiſtolis diſcrepare videatur.' It appears then, that Jerom at the end of the fourth century had not been able to obtain more certain hiſtorical information, than Clement and Origen in the ſecond and third centuries. How then can we, at the end of the eighteenth century, pretend to determine the queſtion? Further, it muſt be remarked, that among the opinions reported by Jerom, relative to the author of the Epiſtle, the name of Barnabas occurs, in addition to thoſe of St. Luke and Clement of Rome, who have been already mentioned as reputed authors of it. This again is mere conjecture, and wholly unſupported by hiſtorical evidence. It is however leſs liable to objection, than the two other opinions, for no writings, at leaſt no genuine writings of Barnabas are now extant: and therefore we cannot oppoſe to this opinion a difference of ſtyle, as may be juſtly done to the opinion, which aſcribes the Epiſtle to

[k] Tom. III. P. ii. 103, 104. ed. Benedict.

to St. Luke, and ſtill more ſo to that, which aſcribes it to Clement of Rome. Further, it is evident, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written not only by a native Jew, but by one, who was well verſed in Jewiſh literature.

Laſtly, it deſerves to be noticed in the preſent inquiry, that in ſome manuſcripts the Epiſtle to the Hebrews is placed between the ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, and the firſt Epiſtle to Timothy: for inſtance, in the celebrated Codex Vaticanus, and in the Codex Upſalenſis collated by Aurivillius. Epiphanius likewiſe, in his 42d Hereſy, obſerves, that ſeveral Greek MSS. in his time had the ſame arrangement, for he ſays, p. 373. αλλα δε αντιγραφα εχει την προς Εβραιους δεκατην, προ των δυο προς Τιμοθεον, και Τιτον, και Φιλημονα. Now this arrangement, according to which the Epiſtle to the Hebrews is placed among St. Paul's Epiſtles, implies, that they, who formed it, were of opinion, that it was written by St. Paul: whereas its common poſition after the Epiſtle to Philemon may be conſtrued as denoting, either that it is the fourteenth (in order) of St. Paul's Epiſtles, or that it is an Epiſtle annexed to thoſe of St. Paul. If the thought had ſooner occurred to me, I would have inquired, what other manuſcripts contain the Epiſtle to the Hebrews in the ſame place as the two juſt mentioned, becauſe they might form a kind of edition of St. Paul's Epiſtles, in which that to the Hebrews was aſcribed to him as the author. Perhaps however ſome future critic will inſtitute this inquiry.

SECT. XVI.

Of the internal marks or characters in the Epiſtle itſelf, from which an inference may be drawn, either in favour of or againſt the opinion, that St. Paul was the author.

IT appears, from the preceding Section, that our preſent queſtion is not to be determined by external evidence, becauſe the accounts of eccleſiaſtical writers on this ſubject are very uncertain, and contradictory. Our only reſource therefore is internal evidence: but this again leaves us in the ſame ſtate of uncertainty as the external. Lardner[l] has already ſtated the arguments, which may be deduced from the contents of the Epiſtle, either for or againſt the queſtion, to which I refer the reader, that he may determine for himſelf. For my own part, I do not agree with Lardner in all the arguments, which he has produced: but as it would be tedious to enumerate and review them, I will confine myſelf at preſent to ſuch remarks as have occurred to me in the ſtudy of this Epiſtle.

In the firſt place I muſt repeat, what has been already aſſerted, that the Greek ſtyle of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews is ſo very different from the ſtyle of St. Paul, that he cannot poſſibly have been the author of the Greek text. Whoever attempts, therefore, to ſhew that St. Paul was the author, muſt firſt acknowledge that the Greek is only a tranſlation, and that the original was Hebrew[m].

In Ch. xiii. 23. the author of this Epiſtle ſays, Γινωσκετε τον αδελφον Τιμοθεον απολελυμενον, μεθ' ου, εαν ταχιον ερχηται, οψομαι υμας. Here the name of Timothy, the uſual companion of St. Paul, with whom the author of this

[l] Supplement, Vol. II. p. 343.

[m] On this head, my opinion is diametrically oppoſite to that of Lardner.

this Epiſtle propoſes to viſit the Hebrews, immediately ſuggeſts the notion, that St. Paul was the author. Yet it affords no abſolute proof: for other perſons, beſide St. Paul, may have formed the deſign of travelling to Jeruſalem in company with Timothy. Some commentators, indeed, tranſlate απολελυμενον in this paſſage by 'ſent abroad on an errand'; and ſay, that ſcarcely any one can be thought of, beſide St. Paul, who would have ſent Timothy abroad upon any ſervice of the Goſpel[n]. But this mode of reaſoning is fallacious. For απολελυμενον ſignifies merely 'gone away,' and by no means implies that Timothy was *ſent* away by the author of this Epiſtle. This paſſage, therefore, does not prove that it was written by St. Paul.

If the common reading, ch. x. 34. και γαρ τοις δεσμοις μου συνεπαθησατε, 'for ye had compaſſion on my bonds,' be the genuine reading, it was well adapted to St. Paul as the author, who at Jeruſalem fell into the captivity, which laſted ſo many years: eſpecially if we take into conſideration ch. xiii. 18, 19. where the author deſires the Hebrews to pray for him, that he may be the ſooner reſtored to them. But the common reading at ch. x. 34. is ſo very uncertain, that no argument can ſafely be founded on it; for many good authorities, inſtead of τοις δεσμοις μου, 'my bonds,' have τοις δεσμιοις, 'the priſoners;' which gives the paſſage a very different ſenſe; and I am wholly unable to determine, which of the two readings deſerves the preference, till the queſtion has been decided, who was the author of the Epiſtle. It appears, indeed, from ch. xiii. 19. that the author had been forced away from the Hebrews, and that he wiſhed to be reſtored to them. This is applicable to St. Paul, who had been taken priſoner at Jeruſalem, and afterwards carried to Rome: but St. Paul is not the only perſon, to whom it is applicable, for other perſons might at the ſame time have been in priſon for the ſake of the Goſpel. Beſides, there is a real inconvenience attending the application of this paſſage to St. Paul: for the

[n] See Lardner, p. 359.

the writer promiſes, ch. xiii. 23. a viſit to the Hebrews, on the return of Timothy. This is a promiſe, which no one could make, who was ſtill in priſon; and therefore I would tranſlate ch. xiii. 19. ἵνα ταχιον αποκατασταθω υμιν, 'that I may have a good and ſpeedy journey to you.'

In fact, the two paſſages, ch. xiii. 19. 23. in which the author expreſſes an intention of viſiting the Hebrews, make it improbable that the author was St. Paul: for he would hardly have formed the reſolution of going again to Jeruſalem, immediately after he was releaſed from his impriſonment in Rome. Not only, he had no vocation to Jeruſalem, as Apoſtle of the Gentiles, but it would have been contrary to his avowed principles, to preach the Goſpel there, ſince he expreſsly ſays in Rom. xv. 20. that he ſtrived to preach the Goſpel, not where Chriſt was named, leſt he ſhould build on another man's foundation. It is true, that this is not the only motive, which might have induced him to go to Jeruſalem, for he might have gone thither to carry alms for the poorer brethren in Judæa, as he had formerly done, when the Macedonians and Achæans contributed for that purpoſe. But this journey he could not well have undertaken immediately after his releaſe, ſince, before he could carry alms to Jeruſalem, it was neceſſary, that he ſhould firſt collect them. And it is a matter of doubt, whether this motive would really have induced him to expoſe himſelf again in a place, where his life had been in danger; for he might ſurely have found a truſty perſon, by whom he might have ſent the contributions, if any had been made. That St. Paul never ſhrinked from danger, where the cauſe of Chriſtianity was concerned, I readily grant: yet he had certainly too much good ſenſe to expoſe himſelf without neceſſity, eſpecially in a place, where the inhabitants were ſo incenſed againſt him, that the commander of the Roman garriſon found it neceſſary to give an eſcort of four hundred and ſeventy men, in order

order to convey him ſafely to Cæſarea[o]. In fact, the cauſe of Chriſtianity did not require, that he ſhould go again to Jeruſalem: and therefore the ſufferings, which he might have endured in conſequence of ſuch a journey, could not have been called ſufferings for the ſake of Chriſt. Beſides, the journey would not only have been imprudent, but really improper: for St. Paul's preſence in Jeruſalem would neceſſarily have occaſioned a tumult, which every good citizen will avoid, out of regard to the ſtate, of which he is a member. Lardner indeed aſſerts, that St. Paul, after his releaſe in Rome, and the avowal of his innocence, might have ſhewed himſelf without danger in Jeruſalem. But this is certainly not true. For the band of deſperate wretches, who had made a vow to murder him, would have paid no regard to the declaration, which the emperor had made of St. Paul's innocence: the Sicarii, of whom Joſephus ſpeaks, were become extremely numerous in Jeruſalem: and the whole country of Paleſtine was already ripe for rebellion. Under theſe circumſtances, I think, that a Roman court of juſtice, if intimation had been given at the time of St. Paul's acquittal, that he intended to go again to Jeruſalem, would have cautioned him againſt appearing in a place, where his preſence might excite ſedition, and where the protection of his perſon would not only give trouble to the magiſtrates, but might occaſion the ſhedding of blood.

Ch. vi. 3. και τυτο ποιησομεν, εαυπερ επιτρεπη ὁ Θεος, implies, it is ſaid, that the author was under the peculiar guidance of God, and that he awaited God's immediate commands. Hence it is inferred, that the author was an Apoſtle, which leads to the concluſion, that the author was St. Paul. But there is no neceſſity for ſuppoſing, that the words, εαυπερ επιτρεπη ὁ Θεος, imply a ſupernatural communication with the Deity, ſince every man, inſpired, or not inſpired, may ſay, 'This I will do, if God permit.' And, if they had really the ſenſe,

[o] Acts xxiii. 23—33.

ſenſe, which has been aſcribed to them, ſtill they would not apply to St. Paul alone: for Barnabas, to whom Tertullian aſſigns the Epiſtle, might have written in this manner.

Ch. x. 33. θεατριζομενοι is an expreſſion perfectly agreeable to St. Paul's mode of writing, as appears from 1 Cor. iv. 9.: but ſince other writers may likewiſe have uſed the ſame metaphor, the application of it in the preſent inſtance ſhews only, that St. Paul might have written the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, not that he really did write it.

Ch. x. 30. εμοι εκδικησις, εγω ανταποδωσω is a quotation from Deut. xxxii. 35. which differs both from the Hebrew text and from the Septuagint: and this paſſage is again quoted in the very ſame words, in Rom. xii. 19. This agreement in a reading, which has hitherto been diſcovered in no other place [p], might form a preſumptive argument, that both quotations were made by the ſame perſon, and conſequently, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul. But the argument is not deciſive: for it is very poſſible, that in the firſt century there were manuſcripts of the Septuagint with this reading in Deut. xxxii. 35. from which St. Paul might have copied in Rom. xii. 19. and the tranſlator of this Epiſtle, in Heb. x. 30.

Laſtly, the Epiſtle to the Hebrews is doctrinal in the former part, as far as ch. x. 19. and the remaining part is exhortatory. This is agreeable to St. Paul's manner. Likewiſe the doctrines themſelves, and the literature diſplayed in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, are in every ſenſe worthy of St. Paul. But on the other hand, in the mode of treating the ſame ſubject, there is a viſible difference between the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, and St. Paul's Epiſtles. In the former the matter is dilated, in the latter compreſſed: in the one the arguments are drawn out at full length, and are eaſier to be underſtood, in the other they are ſo contracted,

[p] See the New Orient. Bibl. Vol. V. p. 231—236.

tracted, and ſo much is left to be ſupplied by the reader, that it is ſometimes difficult to diſcover the Apoſtle's meaning. Five chapters eſpecially of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews [q] diſplay a copiouſneſs of argument, which appears to be inconſiſtent with the conciſe manner of St. Paul.

The arguments therefore on both ſides of the queſtion are nearly of equal weight: but if there is any preponderance, it is in favour of the opinion, that St. Paul was not the author. For the deſign of viſiting Jeruſalem, which the author of this Epiſtle expreſſes, would hardly have been formed by St. Paul on his releaſe from impriſonment. And if St. Paul was really the author, it is difficult to account for the omiſſion of his name at the opening of the Epiſtle, ſince the omiſſion cannot well be aſcribed to a tranſlator, who would not have neglected to retain a name, which gave authority to the Epiſtle [r].

After all then, we muſt confeſs, that we do not know, whether St. Paul wrote this Epiſtle, or not. An abſolute deciſion on this ſubject is indeed to be wiſhed, but, in my opinion, not to be obtained.

[q] Chap. vi—x.

[r] See Sect. 2. of this Chapter.

SECT. XVII.

Examination of the opinion entertained by ſome of the ancients, that Barnabas was the author.

THAT Barnabas was the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was formerly a not unuſual opinion in the Latin church. Now this opinion in itſelf contains nothing improbable: for Barnabas was by birth a Levite, and well acquainted with the Jewiſh laws, and with the Jewiſh literature. Conſequently a learned Epiſtle, like that to the Hebrews, is ſuch as might be expected from his hand. And, if that which is commonly called the Epiſtle of Barnabas, is, as many critics believe, a forgery under his name, we have no writings of Barnabas now extant, which we can oppoſe to the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, and thence argue againſt this opinion from a difference of ſtyle. On this ground therefore it would be difficult to confute the opinion, ſince no one can prove that Barnabas was unable to write as good Greek, as that which is contained in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. But, if on the other hand the Epiſtle aſcribed to Barnabas be really genuine, as other critics aſſert, the ſtate of the queſtion will be materially altered.

The moſt ancient writer, who has mentioned Barnabas, as author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, is Tertullian: and this Latin father ſpeaks, not in dubious terms, but agreeably to his uſual manner in a deciſive tone. In his treatiſe entitled, De Pudicitia, c. 20. he quotes the Epiſtle to the Hebrews in ſupport of the Montaniſtic doctrine, that they who had fallen after baptiſm could not again expect remiſſion of their ſins. He quotes it however not as ſcripture, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe of the word, but as a work of deutero-canonical authority, and as affording only collateral proof[*]. His words

[*] Moſt of the Latin fathers conſidered the Epiſtle to the Hebrews in the ſame light

words are as follow. Volo ex abundantia alicujus comitis apoſtolorum teſtimonium ſuperinducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure diſciplinam magiſtrorum. Extat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos[t], adeo ſatis auctoritatis viri, ut quem Paulus juxtæ ſe poſuerit in abſtinentiæ tenore, 'aut ego ſolus et Barnabas non habemus hoc operandi poteſtatem[u].' Et utique receptior apud eccleſias Epiſtola Barnabæ[w] illo apocrypho Paſtore mæchorum. Monens igitur diſcipulos, omiſſis omnibus initiis, ad perfectionem magis tendere, nec rurſum fundamenta pœnitentiæ jacere operibus mortuorum: impoſſible enim eſt, inquit, illos, qui ſemel inluminati ſunt, et donum cœleſte guſtaverunt, et participarunt ſpiritum ſanctum, et verbum Dei dulce guſtarunt, occidente jam ævo, cum exciderint rurſus revocari in pœnitentiam, refigentes cruci in ſemetipſis filium Dei et dedecorantes. This opinion of Tertullian, that Barnabas was the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, muſt have been entertained in the following centuries by many members of the Latin church, though it does appear to have been adopted by the Greek writers. For Jerom in his Epiſtle to Dardanus[x] ſays: Noſtris dicendum eſt, hanc epiſtolam quæ inſcribitur 'ad Hebræos,' non ſolum ab eccleſiis Orientis, ſed ab omnibus[y] retro eccleſiaſticis Græci ſermonis ſcriptoribus quaſi Pauli apoſtoli ſuſcipi, licet *plerique*[z] eam vel Barnabæ vel Clementis arbitrentur[a].

But

[t] That is, the Epiſtle with the title, 'ad Hebræos.'

[u] 1 Cor. ix. 16.

[w] Here Tertullian means the Epiſtle of Barnabas, commonly ſo called. We ſee likewiſe from this paſſage, that the Epiſtle aſcribed to Barnabas was greatly preferred by the African churches to the Shepherd of Hermas.

[x] Tom. II. p. 608.

[y] Jerom ſhould not have ſaid 'omnibus,' for Origen at leaſt makes an exception. See Sect. 15. of this chapter.

[z] *Plerique* applies here to the members of the Latin church only, who are oppoſed to thoſe of the Greek church mentioned in the former part of the ſentence.

[a] Lardner in his Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, P. II. Vol. x. p. 123, 124. expreſſes a doubt, whether they who aſcribed the Epiſtle

But how great ſo ever the number may have been among the members of the Latin church, who aſcribed this Epiſtle to Barnabas, their aſſertions can be received only as private opinion, not as hiſtorical evidence, becauſe the report is wholly unknown to the moſt ancient Greek fathers. Neither Tertullian, nor Jerom has advanced any argument in its ſupport; and therefore it is difficult at preſent to aſſign the cauſe, which gave it birth. It is however not improbable, that the opinion took its riſe in the following manner. Though the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was not received as a work of St. Paul, on account of the difference of its ſtyle, it was ſtill held, as it juſtly deſerves, in veneration, Clement of Rome, for inſtance, having quoted from it whole paſſages. But of a work, which we eſteem, we always endeavour to diſcover the author, and if we cannot obtain certainty we have recourſe to conjecture, and often aſſign to an anonymous work a name, which we think it deſerves. Now between the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, and that which is called the Epiſtle of Barnabas [b], notwithſtanding their diſſimilarity in other reſpects, there is a reſemblance in the ſelection of the materials, and ſometimes in the choice of the words. The two Epiſtles agree likewiſe in this reſpect, that the author neither of the one, nor of the other, has mentioned his name at the beginning [c], though it was uſual in Greek Epiſtles. Further, both of them abound with explanations

to Barnabas, or to Clement, did not mean, that theſe were only the ſcribes, who wrote what St. Paul dictated. But I cannot ſuppoſe that this was their meaning. In the whole Epiſtle there is no ſalutation either from Barnabas, or from Clement: we have no reaſon to ſuppoſe that Barnabas was with St. Paul when he was releaſed from imprisonment; and, as Barnabas was not only the colleague of St. Paul, but likewiſe greatly his ſenior, it is not probable that Barnabas was employed merely as an amanuenſis.

[b] I here leave the queſtion undecided, whether this Epiſtle be genuine or not.

[c] The Latin tranſlation of the Epiſtle of Barnabas (for the two firſt chapters of the Greek are loſt) begins thus, Avete filii et filiæ in nomine domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti.

tions of paſſages from the Old Teſtament. It is therefore not at all extraordinary that both of theſe anonymous Epiſtles have been aſcribed to the ſame author.

Yet notwithſtanding theſe Epiſtles in ſome reſpects agree, a more minute compariſon of them will ſhew that they cannot well have been written by the ſame author. As Barnabas however may ſtill have written the one, if he did not write the other, we muſt previouſly examine, whether the Epiſtle, which is commonly called the Epiſtle of Barnabas, be genuine. Euſebius refers it to the claſs of ſpurious writings [d]: and I am inclined to accede to this opinion, though I will not decide on the ſubject, becauſe this would require an examination of all the arguments on both ſides of the queſtion. My chief reaſon for thinking that Barnabas was not the author of the Epiſtle, which goes under his name, is, not that it contains ſome very extraordinary interpretations of the Old Teſtament, though even theſe are in my opinion unworthy of Barnabas, but that it contains a paſſage, which betrays ſuch ignorance in regard to the Hebrew letters, as can hardly be expected from a Jewiſh teacher of Chriſtianity, who had long reſided in Jeruſalem. Surely Barnabas muſt have known that Jeſus was written in Hebrew ישוע, with ע, and not ח, and that ת (which in ſome Alphabets has the ſhape of the croſs) denoted, as a numeral, not 300, but 400. Yet there is a paſſage in this Epiſtle, which betrays an ignorance in both theſe reſpects [e].

But

[d] Νοθα. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. III. 25.

[e] The paſſage, which I mean is in § 7. where the author, ſpeaking of the three hundred and eighteen ſervants of Abraham, ſays that the number 318 denotes Jeſus and the Croſs. This he makes out in the following manner. Μαθετε τους δεκαοκτω πρωτους, ειτα τους τριακοσιους. Των γαρ δεκα και οκτω, Ιωτα δεκα, Ητα οκτω. Εχεις Ιησουν. Οτι δε σταυρος εν τω Τ εμελλεν εχειν την χαριν, λεγει και τους τριακοσιους. Δηλοι ουν τον μεν Ιησουν εν τοις δυσι γραμμασι, και ενι ενι τον σταυρον. These words I tranſlate thus. 'Note firſt the 18, and then the 300. Of the 18, Jod is 10, and Heth is 8. Thus you have Jeſus. And becauſe the croſs in the Tau was to obtain grace, he ſays alſo 300. It is evident therefore, that Jeſus is denoted in two letters and the croſs in one.'

But at preſent I will admit, for the ſake of argument, that Barnabas was the author of the Epiſtle, which goes by his name, which appears to have been the opinion of thoſe members of the Latin church, who aſſerted that he was likewiſe the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. On this ſuppoſition a compariſon of the two Epiſtles will ſhew, that Barnabas could not have written the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. For the ſtyle of the one is very different from that of the other, the Epiſtle to the Hebrews being written in more elegant language, than the Epiſtle of Barnabas, though they often agree in ſingle expreſſions. This was not perceived by the Latin fathers, who were for the moſt part ignorant of Greek, or they would not have aſcribed both Epiſtles to the ſame author. In ſubſtance the two Epiſtles differ from each other ſtill more, than in their language; for, though they in ſome meaſure agree in the choice of the materials, as both of them explain many paſſages from the Old Teſtament, yet they diſagree in the mode of treating thoſe materials. Further, the ſtrength of argumentation in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, is greatly ſuperior to that, which appears in the Epiſtle of Barnabas: and it is hardly credible, that the very ſame author, who diſplayed ſuch cloſeneſs of reaſoning in the fifth, ſixth, ſeventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth chapters of the former, could

one.' I have interpreted this paſſage according to the Hebrew alphabet, and not according to the Greek, to which a Jewiſh writer, who lived at Jeruſalem, and wrote about the time of the deſtruction of that city cannot be ſuppoſed to allude. By Ητα therefore he underſtood Heth, and alluded, not to the ſecond letter in Ιησους, but to the laſt letter in the Hebrew word for Jeſus, which he ſuppoſed was written not ישוע, but ישו, confounding ח and ע, which was frequently done by the Samaritans and Galileans, becauſe they pronounced both letters in the ſame manner. Again his Tau is for the ſame reaſon, not Greek but likewiſe oriental. It is true, that in the common Hebrew alphabet Tau is written ת, which is not in the ſhape of a croſs: but in the Phœnician and Samaritan alphabets Tau has the ſhape of a croſs. Now this Tau he ſays denotes 300, whereas every one, who has learnt only the firſt rudiments of Hebrew, knows that Tau, as a numeral denotes 400.—Now two ſuch glaring miſtakes as theſe cannot poſſibly be aſcribed to Barnabas; however weak his underſtanding may have been, and however abſurdly he may have reaſoned on other occaſions.

could uſe ſuch weak and trifling arguments as occur throughout the latter. It is true that, if the firſt chapter of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews proves, according to the common interpretation of it, Chriſt's ſuperiority to the angels from his divinity, and his divinity from paſſages of the Old Teſtament, which have no relation to it: if in the ſecond chapter the eighth pſalm is really quoted as a prophecy of Chriſt: if further the inaccuracy of thoſe paſſages, in which I ſuſpect that the tranſlator has made miſtakes[f], are to be aſcribed, not to the tranſlator, but to the author, the Epiſtle to the Hebrews has likewiſe its weak parts. But whether the author be in fault, or not, theſe paſſages are of a very different kind from the weak parts of the Epiſtle of Barnabas. This difference the Latin fathers in general were unable to perceive: for the Old Teſtament, which is quoted and explained in both Epiſtles, they read not in the Hebrew, but (namely before the time of Jerom) in a wretched Latin tranſlation of the Septuagint Greek verſion.

On the other hand, if it be granted, that Barnabas was not the author of the Epiſtle, which goes by his name, the argument deduced from the diſſimilarity of the ſtyle and the contents of the two Epiſtles will ceaſe to operate. The queſtion therefore is; even on this ground, have we any reaſon to believe that Barnabas wrote the Epiſtle to the Hebrews? I think not; for, if he did, he wrote better Greek, and arranged his materials more clearly and methodically than St. Paul, an opinion which is not very conſiſtent with Acts xiv. 12. where St. Paul, then in company with Barnabas, is deſcribed as being the chief ſpeaker. However, I think it unneceſſary to argue any further on this ground, becauſe it was not occupied by the Latin fathers, who at the ſame time, that they aſcribed to Barnabas the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, believed him likewiſe to be the author of that, which commonly goes by his name.

[f] See Sect. 13. of this chapter.

SECT. XVIII.

Of the canonical authority of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

I NOW come to the very important inquiry, whether the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, under theſe circumſtances, ought to be received as an infallible rule of faith, and placed among the canonical books of the New Teſtament. That the ancients thought differently on this ſubject, ſome allowing it to be canonical, others not, appears from what has been ſaid in the preceding ſections. But before we can determine this queſtion, we muſt firſt agree on a criterion, by which the canonical authority of a book is to be judged. Now according to the principle, which I laid in the chapter on Inſpiration[g], a canonical book of the New Teſtament is a book written by an Apoſtle. If then the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was written by the Apoſtle St. Paul, it is canonical. But if it was not written by an Apoſtle, it is not canonical; for, however excellent its contents may be, they alone will not oblige us to receive it, as a work inſpired by the Deity.

In this light the fathers of the ſecond and third centuries conſidered the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. Tertullian, though he highly approved of its contents, and found in them a ſupport for his own ſevere opinions, quotes it only as collateral evidence, and clearly diſtinguiſhes it from the apoſtolic writings. Origin likewiſe doubted its canonical authority, for no other reaſon, than becauſe he was not convinced that St. Paul was the author, and certainly not, becauſe he had any objection to the doctrines, which it contains. This is evident from what he himſelf ſays a few lines before the words, which I have quoted in the 15th ſection: τα νοηματα της επιστολης θαυμαστα εστι, και ε δευτερα των αποστολικων ὁμολογεμενων γραμματων, και τουτο ἀν συμφησαι ειναι αληθες πας ὁ προσεχων τη αναγνωσει τη αποστολικη. Nor, as far as I know, have any of the fathers grounded their doubts on the doctrines of this

[g] Vol. I. Ch. iii. Sect. 2, 3.

this Epiſtle, though there are ſome paſſages, for inſtance, ch. vi. 4, 5, 6. x. 26. which have been thought inconſiſtent with the benevolence of the Supreme Being. If they doubted of the truth of any of its doctrines, it was becauſe they previouſly doubted whether the Epiſtle was canonical: and they did not argue, in an inverted order, from any ſuppoſed exceptionable paſſages to a want of canonical authority. Nor did Tertullian, though he highly approved of thoſe very paſſages, which others have thought exceptionable, pronounce therefore in favour of its canonical authority. We ſee therefore that in the examination of the preſent queſtion the doctrines contained in the Epiſtle did not influence the judgement of the fathers, either on the one ſide or on the other.

Jerom however has laid down a criterion of canonical authority, which is very different from that aſſumed by the fathers of the ſecond and third centuries. For in his Letter to Dardanus, after having ſaid that the Greek church received the Epiſtle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's, though moſt perſons (namely in the Latin church) ſuppoſed it to have been the work either of Barnabas, or of Clement, adds immediately after the words, which I have quoted in the preceding ſection, 'et nihil intereſſe cujus ſit, cum eccleſiaſtici viri ſit, et quotidie eccleſiarum lectione celebretur.' But if nothing further can be ſaid in favour of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, than that it was written by a 'vir eccleſiaſticus,' according to Jerom's expreſſion, and read daily in the churches, we have a very unſatisfactory proof of its canonical authority, eſpecially when Jerom himſelf leaves it in doubt, who this eccleſiaſtical author was Is every eccleſiaſtical author, it may be aſked, inſpired: and are all writings inſpired, which are read in the churches? The latter queſtion Jerom himſelf has virtually anſwered in the negative: for according to his own account the Latin church denied, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was inſpired, though it was read in the public ſervice. If it could be determined, who this eccleſiaſtical author was, the queſtion would be much more capable of a determinate anſwer. Now they, who have denied that St. Paul was the author, have aſcribed it

either

either to St. Luke, or to Barnabas, or to Clement of Rome. Were St. Luke the author, which however is wholly impoſſible on account of the difference of ſtyle, the Epiſtle to the Hebrews would be on a level with St. Luke's Goſpel and the Acts of the Apoſtles, on the inſpiration of which I have expreſſed ſome doubts in the firſt volume of this Introduction[h]. Were it written by Barnabas, who was St. Paul's oldeſt colleague, it might have on this account a better claim to inſpiration, than the writings of St. Luke. But on the other hand, if the Epiſtle of Barnabas, commonly ſo called, be genuine, the two Epiſtles, as proceeding from the ſame author, will be reduced, in point of authority, to a level, and no man can poſſibly conſider the Epiſtle of Barnabas, as an infallible rule of faith. Laſtly, were Clement the author, it would be no more canonical, than the other writings of Clement. Such are the anſwers, which might be given, if St. Luke, or Barnabas, or Clement were fixed on as the author of this Epiſtle. But when the author is left undetermined, and it is ſaid only in general terms to have been written by an eccleſiaſtical author, how are we to prove that the Epiſtle was inſpired?

If we appeal to the teſtimony of the ancient church, in order to determine the divine authority of this Epiſtle, we ſhall be again left in a ſtate of uncertainty, for on this head the church was at variance with itſelf. The moſt ancient Latin or Weſtern church did not rank it among the canonical writings, though the Epiſtle was well known to them, for Clement of Rome has quoted from it many paſſages. It is true, that ſome Latin writers in the fourth century received it, among whom was Jerom himſelf: yet even in the time of Jerom the Latin church had not placed it among the canonical writings, as appears from various paſſages in the works of Jerom. In his Letter to Dardanus, immediately after the words quoted in the preceding paragraph, he adds: quod ſi eam Latinorum conſuetudo non recipit inter ſcripturas

[h] Ch. iii. Sect. 3.

ſcripturas canonicas, nec Græcorum quidem eccleſiæ Apocalypſin Johannis eadem libertate recipiunt nos[i] tamen utramque ſuſcipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis conſuetudinem, ſed veterum ſcriptorem auctoritatem ſequentes, qui plerumque utriuſque abutuntur teſtimoniis, non ut interdum de apocryphis facere ſolent, quippe qui et gentilium literarum raro utuntur exemplis, ſed quaſi canonicis et eccleſiaſticis. Here is a clear confeſſion of the fact, that the Latin church did not receive the Epiſtle as canonical, though the argument, which Jerom uſes in favour of its canonical authority is a falſe one. Again in his Commentary on the eighth chapter of Iſaiah[k], he ſays, Cæterum beatus Apoſtolus in Epiſtola ad Hebræos (licet eam Latina conſuetudo inter canonicas ſcripturas non recipiat) docet, &c. And in his Note[l] to Zechar. xviii. 14, he ſays, De hoc monte, et de hac civitate et Apoſtolus Paulus (ſi tamen in ſuſcipienda epiſtola Græcorum auctoritatem Latina lingua non reſpuit) ſacrata oratione diſputans, ait. After Jerom's time, the number of thoſe, who received the Epiſtle as canonical, gradually increaſed, and at length its canonical authority ceaſed, in the Latin church, to be a matter of doubt.

In the Syrian church the Epiſtle to the Hebrews is received (and, as far as we know, without exception) as canonical. But I have ſhewn in the ſecond volume of this Introduction, ch. vii. Sect. 2. that the Epiſtle to the Hebrews in the Syriac verſion was not tranſlated by the perſon, who tranſlated the other books of the New Teſtament. In the oldeſt Syrian canon therefore the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was not admitted: but it was afterwards admitted into the canon, and as it appears, in a very ſhort time.

We ſee then that in the early ages of Chriſtianity the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was received as canonical by ſome churches, while other churches did not reckon it among the canonical writings. Whether we ought to receive it as ſuch, depends, according to the criterion laid down in the beginning of this ſection, on the previous

[i] Namely, I Jerom. [k] Tom. III. p 80. [l] Ib. p. 1744.

ous queſtion, whether it was written by an Apoſtle. But we have already ſeen that this previous queſtion cannot, at leaſt not with certainty, be anſwered in the affirmative: conſequently, the canonical authority of the Epiſtle is uncertain. The ſevere doctrines, which are contained in ch. vi. 4, 5, 6, x. 26, 28. have by many been thought exceptionable: but, for my own part, I think them capable of a ſatisfactory explanation. However, if in ch. ii. 6—9. a paſſage from the eighth Pſalm is applied to Chriſt, and in ch. xii. 26, 27. a paſſage from the prophet Haggai is applied to the end of the world, and any man is perſuaded that theſe paſſages have really no ſuch reference, he need not aſk any further queſtions about the inſpiration of the Epiſtle. In my Commentary, I have endeavoured, as far as lay in my power, to reſcue the paſſages, to which objections have been made. I will not aſſert, that I have every where met with ſucceſs: and it is therefore poſſible, that in the Notes, which I intend to publiſh to my tranſlation of the New Teſtament, I ſhall give up points, which I formerly defended, and acknowledge perhaps, that the author was ſometimes inaccurate.

SECT. XIX.

Of the contents of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

THE contents of this Epiſtle I have repreſented at large in my Commentary on it; at preſent therefore I ſhall only give a ſhort ſketch of them.

In the firſt place, the author endeavours to anſwer objections, which the Jews had made to the Chriſtian religion, and which had occaſioned the Jewiſh proſelytes to waver in the faith. He then points out the impending abolition of the Levitical law, and its inefficacy even to

the Jews: which ſubject is treated in a more clear and comprehenſive manner, than in any other book of the New Teſtament. The chief arguments are taken from Pſalm cx. which relates to the Prieſt after the order of Melchiſedek [m], and from the prophecy of Jeremiah relative to a New Covenant. Theſe arguments are produced in the ſeventh and eighth chapters, but the ſubject is ſtill continued in the following chapters.

Here it may be remarked, that St. Paul, though he never permitted the Levitical law to be impoſed on the heathen converts to Chriſtianity, and undoubtedly conſidered it as unneceſſary, ſtill permitted the Jews to continue the exerciſe of it: he likewiſe obſerved it himſelf, and in order to convince the Jews that he did not preach apoſtacy from the law, he made a Nazarite vow, and accompanied it with the neceſſary offerings at Jeruſalem [n]. The open declaration therefore made in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, relative to the abolition of the Levitical law, is to be aſcribed, perhaps to the circumſtance, that it was written not long before the deſtruction of the temple, when the Jewiſh ſacrifices ceaſed.

CHAP. XXV.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

THE Epiſtle of St. James, the two Epiſtles of St. Peter, the firſt Epiſtle of St. John, and the Epiſtle of St. Jude, were not addreſſed to any one perſon, or to any one community in particular: hence they acquired the title of catholic, or general Epiſtles. The ſecond and

[m] Or, of the ſanctuary of Melchiſedek.

[n] Acts xviii. 18. 21, 22. xx. 20—26. xxiv. 17, 18.

and third Epiſtles of St. John do not come under this deſcription: but they were annexed to St. John's firſt Epiſtle, partly becauſe they proceeded from the ſame author, and partly becauſe, as they are very ſhort, they would have been in danger of being loſt, if written by themſelves.

The term 'Catholic' was applied to thoſe Epiſtles in a very early age, for Euſebius uſes it as the common appellation of them in the fourth century. But in the ſixth century the Latin writers began to apply to them the appellation of 'canonical,' of which the firſt inſtance occurs in the writings of Caſſiodorus. Some critics have ſuppoſed that the Latin writers in the ſixth and following centuries confounded the words 'catholicus' and 'canonicus,' and that the former was exchanged for the latter, through mere ignorance. But I would rather aſcribe the origin of the term 'canonicus' to the circumſtance, that the authenticity of five out of the ſeven was formerly doubted, and that the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter and the firſt Epiſtle of St. John were the only two, which the ancient church conſidered as of undoubted authority. Hence the appellation of 'canonical' was at firſt perhaps given to thoſe two Epiſtles only, in order to diſtinguiſh them from the other five. But as the doubts gradually ſubſided, and theſe five were written in the ſame manuſcripts with the other two, the title, which at firſt was a mark of diſtinction for theſe two alone, became at laſt the common appellation of them all. Nay, it is not impoſſible that the term 'Catholic,' as applied to theſe Epiſtles, owes its origin to a ſimilar cauſe, and that it was uſed at firſt to denote the univerſality of their reception: in the ſame manner, as Ebedjeſu in his enumeration of the books, which form the Syrian canon, ſays of the Epiſtle of St. James, the firſt of St. Peter, and the firſt of St. John, that they were acknowledged in all books, and in all languages [o].

Euſebius in his catalogue of the writings of the New Teſtament [p], has placed only the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter, and

[o] Aſſemani Bib. Orient. Tom. III. P. I. p. 9.
[p] Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. III. 25.

and the firſt Epiſtle of St. John, among the ὁμολογουμενα, or books univerſally received by the Chriſtian church. The other five he has placed among the αντιλεγομενα, or books which were not univerſally received. However the Epiſtle of St. James was admitted by the greateſt part of thoſe who rejected the remaining four. Whether they who rejected theſe Epiſtles had good reaſon for ſo doing, will be conſidered in the proper places.

CHAP. XXVI.

OF THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES.

SECT. I.

Previous obſervations, relative to the James, who was called the brother of Jeſus.

BEFORE we examine by what James this Epiſtle was written, it will be neceſſary to premiſe a few obſervations relative to that James, who was called the brother of Jeſus: for without theſe obſervations it will be difficult to ſtate the principal queſtion with preciſion.

St. John [q] and St. Mark [r] have ſpoken in general terms of brethren of Chriſt, ſome of whom did not believe in him, at leaſt not during his life time. St. Matthew [s] has mentioned four by name, James, Joſes, Simon, and Judas [t]: and he has likewiſe ſpoken of ſiſters of Jeſus, who appear to have been more numerous, than they, who are called his brothers. Now the words of St. Matthew, where he ſpeaks of theſe four perſons, are capable

[q] Ch. vii. 3—8. [r] Ch. iii. 21. 31—35.

[s] Ch. xiii. 55. See alſo Mark vi. 3.

[t] As Judas is likewiſe mentioned as brother of Jeſus, the inquiry inſtituted in this ſection applies to the Epiſtle of St. Jude, as well as to the Epiſtle of St. James.

capable of a two-fold interpretation: and the deciſion of our preſent queſtion will in ſome meaſure depend upon that, which we adopt. Namely, St. Matthew's words may be rendered either,

'Are not his brothers called James, Joſes, Simon, and Judas: and are not all his ſiſters with us?'

Or they may be rendered,

'Are not his brothers, James, Joſes, Simon, and Judas, and all his ſiſters with us?'

If we adopt the latter interpretation, it follows, that theſe four brothers of Jeſus were then at Nazareth: but if they were at Nazareth, they could not have been in the number of thoſe, who attended Chriſt on his journies. Conſequently, not one of them could have been an Apoſtle: and they come under the deſcription, which St. John [u] has given of Chriſt's brothers, in whoſe company Chriſt refuſed to go to Jeruſalem.

Now, as James and Judas are here mentioned as brothers of Chriſt, and we have two Epiſtles aſcribed to authors, who bear theſe names, the firſt queſtion, which occurs is, Are they the authors of theſe Epiſtles? But before this queſtion is anſwered, we muſt previouſly examine, in what ſenſe James and Judas, with Joſes and Simon, were called brothers of Chriſt. On this ſubject there are five different opinions.

1. That they were the ſons of Joſeph, not by Mary the mother of Jeſus, but by a former wife. This is a very ancient, and I believe the moſt ancient opinion: nor do I know any material objections which can be made to it. In this ſenſe, James, Joſes, Simon, and Judas were brothers-in-law of Jeſus, and older than he. Now with this repreſentation the accounts given of theſe four perſons are perfectly conſiſtent. For it might be expected, that they lived at Nazareth, and that they would aſſume to themſelves a kind of authority over the actions of Jeſus, out of concern for his ſafety, of which we meet with an inſtance in Mark iii. 21. 31—35. During his life, they might have diſbelieved in him, and yet

[u] Ch. vii. 3—8.

yet have been convinced after his death and reſurrection.

2. That they were the ſons of Joſeph by Mary the mother of Jeſus[w]. In this ſenſe they were own brothers of Jeſus, but younger than he. It is true, that this opinion is not conſiſtent with the notion formerly entertained of the ſuppoſed perpetual virginity. But this notion is wholly incapable of ſupport: and, even if it had been poſſible for Joſeph and Mary to have lived after their marriage in a ſtate of perpetual continency, a life of this kind would not only have been inconſiſtent with ſound reaſon, but, according to the precepts delivered by St. Paul in 1 Cor. vii. would have merited cenſure. On this ground therefore no objection can be made. But there are other reaſons, which render this opinion improbable. For, if theſe four perſons were the ſons of Mary, and the ſiſters mentioned by St. Matthew were likewiſe her daughters, which we muſt ſuppoſe agreeably to this hypotheſis, it cannot be imagined that ſhe had loſt all her children, when Jeſus was crucified: for if all the reſt were dead, which however is not probable, James and Judas were ſtill alive. Yet from the account given by St. John, ch. xix. 26, 27. it ſeems as if Mary was without children, and without ſupport: for Jeſus recommends her to the care of St. John, and commands him to regard her as a mother, on which St. John takes her to his own houſe. On this account it is improbable that Mary, the mother of Jeſus, was likewiſe the mother of James and Judas. I do not mean to aſſert, that Mary never had children by Joſeph, for it appears from Matth. i. 25. that the contrary is probable: but, if ſhe had, they muſt have died young, or at leaſt have been no longer alive, when Chriſt was crucified.

If

[w] This opinion, which is by no means new, has been lately ſupported with great warmth by Herder in his 'Epiſtles of two brothers of Jeſus in our Canon,' publiſhed in 1775. But Herder's arguments have been combated by Gabler, in a diſſertation entitled, De Jacobo epiſtolæ ei attributæ auctore, publiſhed in 1787.

If either the one, or the other, of the two preceding opinions be true[x], and James and Judas, the authors of the Epiſtles, were literally brothers of Chriſt[y], it follows that they were not Apoſtles: for the elder Apoſtle James was the ſon of Zebedee, and the younger Apoſtle James and his brother Judas were ſons of Alphæus. Nor do the titles, which the authors of theſe Epiſtles have given themſelves, indicate that they were Apoſtles: for they call themſelves, not Apoſtles of Jeſus Chriſt, but ſervants of Jeſus Chriſt. But if they were not Apoſtles, their writings can lay no claim to canonical authority. In reſpect to the Epiſtle of St. Jude, this inference is in ſome meaſure warranted by its contents, which are not of ſuch a nature, as to imply divine inſpiration. To the Epiſtle of St. James I have no objections to make, and I ſee nothing in the contents of it, which might form a bar to its canonical authority: but others have thought differently on this ſubject, and the ancients were very much divided about it, as will appear in one of the following ſections.

3. A third opinion relative to James, Joſes, Simon, and Judas, is, that they were ſons of Joſeph by the widow of a brother, who had died without children, and to whom therefore Joſeph by the laws of Moſes was obliged to raiſe iſſue. In this ſenſe, James, Joſes, Simon, and Judas would be again half-brothers of Jeſus. But this opinion I think extremely improbable: for the law which obliged the Jews to take the widows of their brothers, who had died without children, affected thoſe only who were ſingle, and was not extended to thoſe, who were already married[z]. Beſides, as ſoon as one heir

[x] The former I think preferable, for the reaſons already aſſigned.

[y] An objection however may be made from the circumſtance, that in neither the Epiſtle of St. James, nor in that of St. Jude, has the author called himſelf brother of Jeſus. In the former, the author calls himſelf James the ſervant of Jeſus: and in the latter the author gives himſelf the ſame title, with the addition of 'brother of James,' whereas if he had been really brother of Jeſus, he would probably have preferred this more diſtinguiſhed appellation.

[z] See my Moſaic law, § 98.

heir was born of the brother's widow, all was done, which the law required: but according to this opinion Joſeph had four ſons, and ſeveral daughters by his brother's widow, and that too at a time, when his own wife was alive, by whom according to the ſame opinion he had no children.

4. The preceding opinion may be delivered, with ſome alteration, in the following manner: that Joſeph's deceaſed brother, to whom the laws required, that he ſhould raiſe iſſue, was Alphæus. In this caſe, James and Judas who are called brothers of Jeſus, will be the ſame as the Apoſtles James and Judas, who are called ſons of Alphæus, Matth. x. 3. But, if this repreſentation be true, Alphæus cannot be the ſame perſon with Clopas, as is frequently ſuppoſed: for Clopas had in marriage the ſiſter of Joſeph's wife.

5. According to the fifth opinion, which was firſt advanced by Jerom, and has been very generally received, James, Joſeph, Simon, and Judas, were brothers of Chriſt, not in the ſtrict ſenſe of the word 'brother,' but in a more lax ſenſe, namely, in that of couſin, or relation in general, agreeably to the uſage of this word in the Hebrew language. And the relationſhip of theſe four perſons to Jeſus is derived according to this opinion, not from the ſide of Joſeph, but from that of Mary, and in the following manner. James and Judas are the ſame as the Apoſtles, James and Judas, who were ſons of Alphæus: conſequently, Alphæus was the father alſo of Simon and Joſes. Further, Alphæus is the ſame perſon with Clopas[a], for the Hebrew name חַלְפַי may be expreſſed in Greek either by Αλφαιος or by Κλωπας. Now Clopas married the ſiſter of Chriſt's mother, who was likewiſe called Mary[b]: conſequently, the ſons of Clopas were firſt couſins of Jeſus, and

[a] Not Cleopas, for the Greek name is Κλωπᾶς. St. Luke ch. xxiv. 18. ſpeaks of a Cleopas (Κλεοπας), but he appears to be a different perſon, Κλεοπας being a contraction for Κλεοπατρος.

[b] See John xix. 25. Matth. 56. Mark xv. 40.

and in this extended ſenſe of the word αδελφος are James, Joſes, Simon, and Judas called αδελφοι τυ Ιησυ.

Now this opinion, to which I formerly ſubſcribed, appears to me at preſent leſs probable: for it depends entirely on the queſtion, whether Αλφαιος and Κλωπας are only two different names of one and the ſame perſon called in Hebrew חלפי, which is poſſible and nothing more. Appeal indeed is made to Gal. i. 19. where St. Paul ſays, ἑτερον δε των αποςολων ουκ ειδον, ει μη Ιακωβον, τον αδελφον τυ Κυριυ, which ſeems to imply, that James, who was called the brother of the Lord, was one of the twelve Apoſtles. But this is not a neceſſary inference; for St. Paul might intend only to ſay, that he had ſeen no other Apoſtle than St. Peter, whom he had juſt mentioned, but that he ſaw James the brother of the Lord. Further, there is a difficulty attending the circumſtance, that Joſeph and Clopas married two ſiſters, each of which was called Mary. It is very unuſual for two ſiſters to have the ſame name, except where, in addition to the name, which they have in common, they have each of them another name: but in this caſe it is uſual to denote them, not by their common, but by their particular names. I think it therefore probable that Mary, the wife of Clopas, was not properly the ſiſter of Mary, the wife of Joſeph, but only her couſin, or relation.

Of the five opinions, which I have thus enumerated, there are only two, which, in my opinion, are at all probable; and theſe are the firſt, and the laſt. Which of theſe two ought to be preferred, I will not undertake to determine. I was formerly attached to the latter, becauſe I had been taught from my youth that it was the true one, and had heard it ſupported by very ſpecious arguments. But the more I have examined it, the more I have doubted of its truth: and at preſent it appears to me leſs probable, than the firſt opinion. I ſhall leave the queſtion however undetermined, and argue in the following ſections hypothetically.

SECT. II.

Whether the author of this Epiſtle was an Apoſtle; and if he was, whether he was the elder or the younger Apoſtle James.

IF it be granted, that the author of this Epiſtle was an Apoſtle, notwithſtanding he has not aſſumed this title, and it be admitted at the ſame time, that James, the brother, or couſin of Chriſt, was one of the twelve Apoſtles, the queſtion to be aſked is, which of the Apoſtles was the author, ſince there were two Apoſtles called James? The one, who was called the elder James, was ſon of Zebedee, and brother of John[c]; he was one of the three Apoſtles, in whom Chriſt placed the greateſt confidence, who alone were witneſſes to the raiſing of Jairus's daughter from the dead, to the transfiguration of Chriſt on the mount, and to his agony in the garden. He likewiſe ſuffered martyrdom not many years after the death of Chriſt. The other Apoſtle James was the ſon of Alphæus[d]; and this is the James, to whom they, who adopt the fifth opinion mentioned in the preceding ſection, aſcribe the Epiſtle in queſtion.

There are very ancient traditionary reports, which attribute the Epiſtle to the elder James, the ſon of Zebedee. In the Codex Corbeienſis, the manuſcript of the old Latin verſion, publiſhed by Martianay and Sabatier, the ſubſcription to this Epiſtle is, 'Explicit epiſtola Jacobi, filii Zebedæi.' In the Syriac verſion, into which the Epiſtle of St. James, the firſt of St. Peter, and the firſt of St. John, have alone been admitted as canonical, theſe three Epiſtles have the following

[c] Matth. x. 2. Mark i. 19. iii. 17. Luke v. 10.

[d] Matth. x. 3.

lowing joint ſubſcription, according to the edition of Widmanſtadt. 'In the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, we here cloſe the three Epiſtles of James, Peter, and John, who were witneſſes to the revelation of our Lord, when he was transfigured on mount Tabor, and who ſaw Moſes and Elias ſpeaking with him.' In the edition of the Syriac verſion publiſhed by Tremellius, the ſubſcription is to the ſame purport, though more conciſe: 'The three Epiſtles of the three Apoſtles, before whoſe eyes our Lord was transfigured, namely, James, Peter, and John.' According to this ſubſcription then the elder James, the ſon of Zebedee, was the author of this Epiſtle: for he, and not the younger James, the ſon of Alphæus, was preſent at the transfiguration. In the Polyglot Bibles however this ſubſcription is omitted: nor is there any ſubſcription of this kind in the Polyglot Arabic verſion, as ſome have ſuppoſed. On the contrary, the Arabic verſion publiſhed by Erpenius, which was made from the Syriac verſion, has both a ſuperſcription and a ſubſcription to the Epiſtle of St. James, in which the Epiſtle is aſcribed to 'James the brother of the Lord.' Now James, called the brother of Jeſus, could not poſſibly be the elder James, the ſon of Zebedee: but was either the ſon of Alphæus, or not in the number of the twelve Apoſtles. Profeſſor Haſſencamp, in his Remarks on the latter part of my introduction[e], has quoted two other authorities, and both of them Syrian, which attribute the Epiſtle to James the brother of the Lord. The one is Ephrem, who ſays, Ιακωβος, ὁ τȣ Κυριȣ αδελφος, λεγει· Πενθησατε και κλαυσατε, ὁ γελως ὑμων εις πενθος μετατραφητω, και ἡ χαρα εις κατηφειαν, which words are taken from James iv. 9. The other authority is a Syrian miſſal, preſerved in the Vatican, and deſcribed in Aſſemani Cat. MSS. Vatic. T. II. p. 344. From this miſſal is quoted the following paſſage:

The

[e] Publiſhed at Marburg, in 1767.

The authorities (if ſubſcriptions deſerve the name) which I have quoted in the beginning of the preceding paragraph, in favour of the opinion, that the elder James, the ſon of Zebedee, was the author of our Epiſtle, I have alleged, not with a view of prepoſſeſſing the reader in its favour, but merely to ſhew what the ancients have thought on this ſubject. However, I do not agree with many modern writers, who think, that the opinion is abſurd. For this reaſon Lardner conſidered it as unworthy of a confutation: but Benſon, who likewiſe rejected the opinion, did not think it ſo contemptible, for he has brought the following arguments againſt it, to each of which I will make a reply.

1. 'James the elder was beheaded about the year 43 or 44. If therefore he was the author of our Epiſtle, it muſt have been the firſt written of all the apoſtolic Epiſtles. But this is not probable, becauſe it was the uſual practice of the Apoſtles, firſt to preach the Goſpel verbally, then to pay one or more viſits to the Chriſtian communities, and laſt of all to write to them.'

Anſwer. If we admit, that St. Paul followed this rule, from whoſe Epiſtles Dr. Benſon appears to have derived it, it is no neceſſary conſequence, that other Apoſtles obſerved it, and that none of them wrote an Epiſtle to a Chriſtian community, in which he had not verbally taught, or to which he had not already paid one or more viſits: for if an Apoſtle was prevented from going in perſon, this very circumſtance might induce him to communicate inſtructions by letter. But this rule is not true, even when applied to St. Paul. For he wrote to the Romans and Coloſſians, before he had ever ſeen them: and the Epiſtles to the Galatians and the Theſſalonians were written almoſt immediately after their converſion, or at leaſt as ſoon as we may ſuppoſe, that the elder James wrote, after the converſion of another community.

2. 'Before the death of the elder James, the preaching of the Goſpel was chiefly confined within the limits of Paleſtine: but our Epiſtle was written to Chriſtians of the diſperſion, that is, to Chriſtians out of Paleſtine.'

Anſwer. That the Goſpel was not preached without the limits of Paleſtine before the death of the elder James, is a poſition, which is grounded only on the ſilence of the Acts of the Apoſtles. But this inference is hardly defenſible: for it was not St. Luke's object to give a complete hiſtory of all the tranſactions, which took place in the Chriſtian church[f], and therefore his ſilence in reſpect to the propagation of Chriſtianity out of Paleſtine within the firſt ten years after the crucifixion, will not warrant the inference, that it was preached during this interval in Paleſtine alone. On the contrary, there is reaſon to believe, that it actually was propagated in diſtant countries within a very few years after the death of Chriſt. For not to mention, that St. Paul preached the Goſpel in Arabia, and that the eunuch of Candace, queen of Ethiopia, was baptized by Philip, on which I will not inſiſt, becauſe into neither of theſe countries would a Greek Epiſtle have been ſent, there were Jews preſent at Jeruſalem from Cappadocia, Pontus, Aſia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, Cyrene, and Rome, when the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt were firſt communicated to the Apoſtles on the day of Pentecoſt, and they acknowledged the wonderful powers, which the Apoſtles had received[g]. Now it cannot be ſuppoſed, that theſe perſons neglected, on their return to their own countries, to make known the Chriſtian religion: and we know, that in Alexandria, and in Rome, there were Chriſtians before any Apoſtle came thither. At Damaſcus there were likewiſe Chriſtians[h], though perhaps they did not ſpeak Greek; but

[f] See what was ſaid on this ſubject, Ch. viii. Sect. 2.

[g] Acts ii. 5—11. [h] Acts ix.

but Tarſus, where Greek was ſpoken, had been viſited by St. Paul, between the time of his converſion and the death of the elder James[i]; and St. Paul hardly ſpent his time there without making converts. Chriſtians from Cyprus and Cyrene were already become preachers of the Goſpel, and by their means a very flouriſhing community had been eſtabliſhed at Antioch, which attracted the particular notice of the Apoſtles at Jeruſalem[k]. There was a ſufficient number of Jewiſh converts to Chriſtianity out of Paleſtine before the death of the elder James, to occaſion an Epiſtle addreſſed to 'the twelve tribes, which are ſcattered abroad.' Nay, the communities in Antioch and its neighbourhood were alone almoſt ſufficient to have occaſioned ſuch an Epiſtle.

3. 'Among the Jewiſh converts, to whom the Epiſtle of St. James was addreſſed, there prevailed a great corruption of morals, and of doctrines, eſpecially in the article of Juſtification, which aroſe from a perverſion of the precepts delivered by St. Paul on this ſubject. Now the perverſion of a doctrine, which is in itſelf clear and intelligible, ſeldom takes place, till ſome time has elapſed after the firſt delivery of that doctrine, and till it has gone through a great variety of hands. Conſequently, an Epiſtle, like that of St. James, in which the falſe notions, which prevailed in regard to Juſtification, are corrected, could not have been written ſo early, as during the life of the elder James.'

Anſwer. This argument is founded on a miſtake: for the Juſtification, of which the author of our Epiſtle ſpeaks, is a very different kind of Juſtification from that of which St. Paul ſpeaks. It is the old Jewiſh doctrine of Juſtification, and not a miſunderſtood doctrine of St. Paul, which the author of this Epiſtle combats[l]: conſequently, the argument deduced from

[i] Acts ix. 30. [k] Acts xi. 20—30.

[l] This will be fully proved in the ſixth ſection of this chapter.

from it in regard to the time, when the Epiſtle was written, falls at once to the ground. And as to the ſins, againſt which the author of this Epiſtle warns, they were ſuch, as were common among the Jews, and were brought by the Jewiſh converts into the Chriſtian church: for we muſt not imagine, that the firſt Chriſtian communities conſiſted wholly of members, who were in a ſtate of perfect regeneration.

Further, this argument not only proves, that the Epiſtle of St. James was written at a late period, but may really be applied to prove the very reverſe. The author of our Epiſtle combats the Jewiſh notion, that they would be juſtified or ſaved merely by their faith in the one ſupreme God[m]. Hence, it may be inferred, that St. Paul had not yet preached in thoſe communities, to which this Epiſtle was addreſſed, and that his tropus pædiæ was not known to them: for if it were, our author would probably have avoided the apparent contradiction, which neceſſarily ariſes from his having uſed the term Juſtification in a different ſenſe from that, which St. Paul aſcribed to it. Beſides, if St. Paul had already taught in thoſe communities, to which the Epiſtle of St. James was addreſſed, it is probable, that they would have been better inſtructed, than from this Epiſtle they appear to have been. On theſe accounts therefore I am really inclined to aſcribe a very early date to this Epiſtle.

4. 'In ch. v. 8. the coming of the Lord to judge Jeruſalem is repreſented as being near at hand: conſequently, the Epiſtle could not have been written by a perſon, who was beheaded not leſs than ſeven-and-twenty years before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem.

Anſwer. Without entering into the queſtion, whether alluſion is made in James v. 8. to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, which however is a matter of doubt, I will only obſerve, that the terms, 'near,' and 'diſtant,' are merely relative, and may denote a greater or ſmaller portion of time, according to the rule or meaſure,

[m] See the ſixth ſection of this chapter.

ſure, by which they are eſtimated. More than twenty-ſeven years muſt elapſe before the preſent century expires[n]: and yet, if I expected that a great revolution would take place in Europe before the cloſe of this century, I might, without impropriety, deſcribe it as not far diſtant. In ſhort, the deſtruction of a ſtate, which has laſted many centuries, may be ſaid to be near at hand, if it ſhall happen within the preſent generation, and the half of thoſe, who are now alive, ſurvive it. This argument therefore is indeciſive.

All things conſidered then, I ſee no ground for the aſſertion, that the elder James was not the author of this Epiſtle: though on the other hand, I will not poſitively affirm, that he was. One circumſtance however affords at leaſt a preſumptive argument in favour of the opinion, that it was really written by the elder James, and at a time when the Goſpel had not been propagated among the Gentiles: namely, that it contains no exhortations to harmony between the Jewiſh and Gentile converts, which, after the time that the Gentiles were admitted into the church, became abſolutely neceſſary. Had it been written after the apoſtolic council at Jeruſalem, mentioned in the 15th chapter of the Acts, and by the younger James, we might have expected that at leaſt ſome alluſion would be made in it to the decree of this council, which was propounded by the younger James in favour of the Gentile converts, and that the Epiſtle would contain an admonition to the Jewiſh converts, to conſider the Gentile converts as their brethren. On a ſecond conſideration however I perceive that this argument applies rather to the time, when the Epiſtle was written, than to the author of it: for the younger James might have written it as early, as it is ſuppoſed that the elder James wrote it, and either of the ſuppoſitions will account for the circumſtance, that the Epiſtle contains no exhortations to harmony between the Jews and Gentiles.

To

[n] This I wrote in 1766.

To the argument, which I have here uſed in favour of an early date, may be oppoſed another argument in favour of a late date, and conſequently in favour of the opinion, that the Epiſtle was not written by the elder James. Namely, it may be ſaid, that if this Epiſtle had been written before the apoſtolic council at Jeruſalem was held, it would hardly have remained unknown to St. Paul. But if St. Paul had ſeen this Epiſtle, he would have probably uſed ſuch terms in his Epiſtles to the Romans and Galatians, as would have prevented all appearance of contradiction between this Epiſtle and his own writings. I mention this as an argument, which may be produced on the preſent queſtion, though I by no means think it a deciſive one.

After all then I muſt confeſs my uncertainty, and muſt leave the queſtion undecided.

SECT. III.

Whether the author of this Epiſtle was St. James, called the brother of Jeſus.

IN the firſt ſection of this chapter, where I have enumerated the five different opinions relative to James, Joſes, Simon, and Judas, who are called brothers of Jeſus, Matth. xiii. 55. I have ſhewn, that the moſt ancient opinion is, that they were ſons of Joſeph by a former wife, and brothers in law of Chriſt. Now there is no improbability in the ſuppoſition, that a brother in law of Chriſt wrote the Epiſtle in queſtion; and that this was a very common opinion in the four firſt centuries, appears from what Jerom has ſaid in his Catalogue

Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, though Jerom himſelf did not ſubſcribe to it.

The Epiſtle itſelf however contains nothing, which warrants the inference, that the author of it was a brother of Chriſt, for the author calls himſelf only 'the ſervant of Chriſt:' and St. Jude, though he expreſsly calls himſelf 'brother of James, names himſelf in like manner 'ſervant,' and not 'brother of Chriſt.' Hence it may be objected, that if the James and the Jude, who wrote theſe Epiſtles, had been brothers as well as ſervants of Chriſt, they would not have aſſumed merely the latter title: for the appellation of 'brother and ſervant of Chriſt, would not only have been more honourable, but more characteriſtic, and would more eaſily have diſtinguiſhed them from other diſciples of the ſame name, than the bare appellation of 'ſervant.' Now if the expreſſion 'brother of Chriſt,' as applied to James, Joſes, Simon and Judas, Matth. xiii. 55. be explained, according to the ſecond opinion delivered in the firſt ſection of this chapter, as denoting, that they were the ſons of Joſeph and Mary, I think that the objection is hardly capable of an anſwer: for in that caſe, ſince the mother of Chriſt, was likewiſe their mother, the appellation of 'brother of Chriſt' was due to them in the ſtricteſt ſenſe. But the objection will loſe its force, if we adopt the firſt opinion, namely, that theſe four perſons were ſons of Joſeph, not by Mary, but by a former wife. For in this caſe, though their father Joſeph was the reputed father of Chriſt, and he is named as ſuch in Chriſt's genealogy, yet if James and Jude believed in Mary's ſupernatural conception of Chriſt, they muſt have been conſcious to themſelves, that they were really not his brothers, and therefore that they could not without impropriety aſſume the title.

James, called the brother of Chriſt, had likewiſe the appellation of James the Juſt, and ſtood in very high reputation among the Jews. This is confirmed by a paſſage

* Tom. IV. P. ii. p. 101. ed Benedict.

paſſage of Joſephus [p], which I ſhall preſently quote. Further, he is ſaid to have been biſhop of Jeruſalem: and (if we diſtinguiſh James the brother of Jeſus from the Apoſtle James) he is that important perſon, by whoſe opinion the Apoſtolic council at Jeruſalem, deſcribed Acts xv. 13—29. abided, who again appears as a principal perſon in the church of Jeruſalem, Acts xxi. 18—26. He is likewiſe mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 7. Gal. i. 19. ii. 9. 12.: among which paſſages, Gal. ii. 9. deſerves particularly to be noticed, becauſe he is not only there called one of the pillars of the church, but is ranked even before St. Peter, on account of his great authority in Jeruſalem. He every where appears as the friend of St. Paul, with whoſe ſentiments his own coincide. At the ſame time he was extremely cautious not to give offence to the Jews, on whoſe account he propoſed, that the heathen converts ſhould be admoniſhed to abſtain from blood and from meats offered to idols; which doctrine St. Paul not only adopted and delivered to the church of Antioch, by virtue of the apoſtolic decree, but likewiſe recommended and explained in his Epiſtles, eſpecially Rom. xiv. 1 Cor. viii. x. Now the contents of the Epiſtle of St. James are ſuch as might be expected from a writer of this deſcription; and if he was the author, we have an additional argument, in favour of the opinion, that it contains nothing contradictory to St. Paul's doctrines [q].

Though it would be foreign to the preſent purpoſe to collect all the circumſtances, which have been recorded of St. James, called the brother of Chriſt, yet I think it neceſſary to quote two paſſages concerning him; the one from the work of Joſephus, the other from the works of Hegeſippus, who lived in the time of

[p] Namely, if the James, of whom Joſephus ſpeaks, be the ſame perſon as James, the brother of Chriſt, and not the younger Apoſtle James, according to the fifth opinion.

[q] See the ſixth ſection of this chapter.

of Hadrian[r]: becauſe theſe two paſſages exhibit ſuch a character of him, as the Epiſtle itſelf ſuggeſts of its author, and have likewiſe material influence on the queſtion, whether the Epiſtle was intended for the uſe of Chriſtians only, or of Jews as well as of Chriſtians.

The account, which Joſephus has given, relates to the death of St. James, which muſt have happened during St. Paul's impriſonment, and is delivered in the following words[s]. 'The emperor, being informed of the death of Feſtus, ſent Albinus to be prefect of Judæa. But the younger Ananus, who, as we ſaid before, was made high prieſt, was haughty in his behaviour, and very enterpriſing. He was alſo of the ſect of the Sadducees, who, as we have alſo obſerved before, are above all other Jews ſevere in their judicial ſentences. This then being the temper of Ananus, he thinking he had a convenient opportunity, becauſe Feſtus was dead, and Albinus was not yet arrived, called a council, and brought before it James, brother[t] of Jeſus, who was called Chriſt[u], with ſeveral others, where they were accuſed of being tranſgreſſors of the law, and ſtoned to death. But the moſt moderate men of the city, who

[r] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. IV. c. 8.

[s] Antiquit. Lib. XX. cap. 9.

[t] In the writings of Joſephus the word ἀδελφὸς can hardly admit of any other meaning, than that in which it was uſed by the Greeks. Here therefore it cannot well ſignify 'couſin,' and conſequently it implies, that James was the ſon of Joſeph.

[u] As Jeſus was not an uncommon name among the Jews, Joſephus adds the title of Chriſt merely as a mark of diſtinction; and this expreſſion affords no ground for the ſuppoſition, that Joſephus himſelf believed, that the perſon, of whom he ſpake, was the expected Meſſiah. What his real opinion was, is a queſtion foreign to the preſent inquiry: but from his manner of ſpeaking of the death of St. James in this place, and from the excellent character, which he gives of John the Baptiſt in another, he ſeems to have been at leaſt no enemy to Chriſtianity, whether the celebrated paſſage, Antiquit. XVIII. 3. 3. relative to Chriſt and his miracles, be genuine (as I myſelf believe), or not.

who were alſo the moſt learned in the laws[w], were offended at this proceeding. They ſent therefore privately to the king, and intreated him to give orders to Ananus to abſtain from ſuch conduct in future. And ſome went to meet Albinus, who was coming from Alexandria, and repreſented to him, that Ananus had no right to call a council without his permiſſion. Albinus, approving of what they ſaid, wrote a very ſevere letter to Ananus, threatening to puniſh him for what he had done. And king Agrippa[x] took away from him the prieſthood, after he had poſſeſſed it three months, and appointed in his ſtead Jeſus, the ſon of Damnæus.' From this account of Joſephus we learn, that St. James, notwithſtanding he was a Chriſtian, was ſo far from being an object of hatred to the Jews, that he was rather beloved and reſpected. At leaſt his death excited very different ſenſations from that of the elder James[y]; and the Sadducean high prieſt, at whoſe inſtigation he ſuffered, was puniſhed for his offence by the loſs of his office.

The account given by Hegeſippus[z] contains an intermixture of truth and fable, and in ſome material points

[w] Here Joſephus meant probably the Phariſees, who were much leſs inimical to the Chriſtians, than the Sadducees were, as appears from Acts v. 34—39. xxiii. 6—9. The high prieſts Annas and Caiaphas, who had been the chief inſtruments in bringing Chriſt to the croſs, were likewiſe Sadducees; and, as appears from Acts v. 28, they conſidered thoſe, who aſſerted the reſurrection of Chriſt, and confirmed by it his divine miſſion, as perſons, who endeavoured to bring Chriſt's blood on their heads. Now the younger Ananus was ſon of Annas, and brother in law of Caiaphas; and James was not only a teacher of Chriſtianity, and highly reſpected by the Jews, but was likewiſe a ſpecial witneſs to the truth of Chriſt's reſurrection, as St. Paul relates, 1 Cor. xv. 7.

[x] That Agrippa did not entertain unfavourable ſentiments of Chriſtianity, and that in his opinion a teacher of the Goſpel by no means deſerved to ſuffer death, is evident from Acts xxv. 23—xxvi. 32. eſpecially from the two laſt verſes of the twenty-ſixth chapter.

[y] Acts xii.

[z] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. II. cap. 23.

points contradicts the relation of Joſephus, to which no objection can be made. It confirms however the aſſertion, that St. James was in great repute among the Jews, even among thoſe, who did not believe in Chriſt; and that they paid him much greater deference, than we might ſuppoſe they would have ſhewn to a Chriſtian biſhop, and a brother of Chriſt, whom they had crucified. The words of Hegeſippus, as quoted by Euſebius, are the following: 'James, the brother of our Lord, undertook, together with the Apoſtles [a], the government of the church. He has been called the Juſt by all, from the time of our Saviour to the preſent time. Many have borne the name of James: but this man was holy from his mother's womb. He drank neither wine, nor ſtrong drink, nor did he eat any animal food [b]. There came no razor on his head. He neither anointed himſelf with oil, nor did he uſe a bath. To him alone was it lawful to enter the ſanctuary. He wore no woollen, but only linen garments. He entered into the temple alone, where he prayed upon his knees: ſo that his knees were become like the knees of a camel, in conſequence of his being continually upon them, worſhipping God, and praying for the forgiveneſs of the people. On account of his virtue he was called the Juſt, and Oblias, that is, the defence of the people, and righteouſneſs, as the prophets ſpeak of him. Some therefore of the ſeven ſects, which were among the Jews, of whom I ſpake in the former part of theſe commentaries, aſked him, Which was

[a] Here James, the brother of Jeſus, is diſtinguiſhed in expreſs terms from the Apoſtles. Hegeſippus therefore does not ſpeak of an Apoſtle James. Nor did Euſebius conſider James, the brother of Jeſus, as one of the Apoſtles, from whom he plainly diſtinguiſhes him, ſaying in the beginning of the third chapter, in which he quotes this paſſage of Hegeſippus, 'James, the brother of our Lord, whom the Apoſtles appointed biſhop of Jeruſalem.'

[b] Hegeſippus repreſents St. James as being more holy than Chriſt himſelf, who ate meat, drank wine, and was more than once anointed.

was the gate of Jeſus [c]? and he ſaid, This is our Saviour. Some of them therefore believed, that Jeſus was the Chriſt. But the ſeven ſects did not believe a reſurrection, nor that any one would come, to reward every man according to his works. They however, who believed, did it for the ſake of James. And ſince many of the chief men believed, a diſturbance aroſe among the Jews, among the Scribes and Phariſees, who apprehended there was danger, that all the people would think Jeſus to be the Chriſt. Coming therefore to James, they ſaid, We beſeech thee to reſtrain the error of the people. We intreat thee to perſuade all that come hither at the time of the paſſover, to think rightly concerning Jeſus: for all the people, and all of us place confidence in thee, and teſtify that thou art Juſt, and art no reſpecter of perſons. Place thyſelf therefore on the battlement of the temple, that being placed on high thou mayeſt be conſpicuous, and that thy words may be eaſily heard by all the people: for on account of the paſſover all the tribes are come hither, and many Gentiles. Therefore the Scribes and Phariſees placed James upon the battlement of the temple, and cried out to him and ſaid, O thou juſt man, whom we ought all to believe, the people are in error following Jeſus, who was crucified: tell us therefore, what is the gate of Jeſus the crucified. And he anſwered with a loud voice, Why do you aſk me concerning Jeſus the ſon of man? He ſitteth in heaven, at the right hand of the great Power, and will come in the clouds of heaven. Many therefore believed, and were well pleaſed with the teſtimony of James, ſaying, Hoſanna to the ſon of David! But the Scribes and Phariſees ſaid to one another, We have done wrong in procuring ſuch

[c] Moſheim (De Rebus Chriſtian. ante Conſtant. M. p. 95.) ſuppoſes, and I think his ſuppoſition highly probable, that the queſtion propoſed to St. James was, 'Which is the gate of ſalvation (ישועה)?' and that Hegeſippus confounded ישועה with ישוע and thus converted the queſtion into, 'Which is the gate of Jeſus?'

ſuch a teſtimony to Jeſus. Let us go up and throw him down, that the people may be terrified from giving credit to him.' Hegeſippus then relates, what is of leſs conſequence to the preſent purpoſe, the circumſtances attending his death, that he was thrown down from the temple, ſtoned, and finally killed by the ſtroke of a fuller's club. Now many parts of the preceding account are undoubtedly fabulous, eſpecially that part, which relates to the requeſt of the Jews, that St. James would openly declare from the battlements of the temple, that Jeſus was not the Meſſiah. Indeed if this were true, it would not redound to his honour: for it would imply, that he had acted with duplicity, and not taken a decided part in favour of Chriſtianity, or the Jews could never have thought of making ſuch a requeſt. But that a perſon, who was the head of the church in Jeruſalem, ſhould have acted ſuch a double part, as to leave it undecided what party he had embraced, and that too for thirty years after the aſcenſion, is in itſelf almoſt incredible. It is inconſiſtent likewiſe with the relation of Joſephus, and is virtually contradicted both by St. Paul and by St. Luke, who always ſpeak of him with the utmoſt reſpect, and have no where given the ſmalleſt hint, that he concealed the principal doctrines of the Chriſtian religion [d].

From what has been ſaid in this ſection, it appears, that the opinion entertained in the early ages of Chriſtianity, that St. James, called the brother of Jeſus, was the author of the Epiſtle in queſtion, is by no means improbable: and the more I conſider it, the more I am inclined to prefer it to that, which prevailed in the time of Jerom. A perſon, who was brother, that is, brother in law, of the founder of the Chriſtian religion, who preſided many years over the Chriſtian community in Jeruſalem, who was conſidered as one of the pillars of

[d] See 1 Cor. xv. 7. Gal. i. 19. ii. 6—9. Acts xv. 13—29. xxi. 18—26.

of the church, and who at the ſame time was ſo delicate in his conduct toward the Jews, that even they, who did not believe, reſpected him, is exactly ſuch a perſon, as the author of our Epiſtle, as far as we may judge from its contents, appears to have been. Abſolute certainty however is hardly to be obtained, becauſe our hiſtorical information is here defective. We have no writer to whom we can appeal on this ſubject; and Hegeſippus, who lived in the former part of the ſecond century, and who therefore had the means of procuring intelligence, has ſo blended his account with fable, that no dependence can be placed on it.

SECT. IV.

Of the perſons, to whom this Epiſtle was written.

ST. JAMES, the author of this Epiſtle (whether the elder or the younger James, or whether he was a brother of Chriſt, I leave here undecided), begins in the following manner: 'James, a ſervant of God, and of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to the twelve tribes, which are ſcattered abroad, greeting.' He addreſſed therefore his Epiſtle, not to heathen converts, but to native Jews[e], who lived out of Paleſtine[f], and (ſince the

[e] That the ten tribes really returned from the Babylonian captivity, is ſhewn in Benſon's Prolegomena; and I have confirmed it in my eſſay entitled, De exſilio decem tribuum, printed in the Commentationes ſocietati regiæ Goettingenſi per annos 1758—1762, oblatæ.

[f] The opinion of Beza, relative to the word διασπορα, which however is inconſiſtent with the uſe of this word among the Helleniſts, may be ſeen in Lardner's Supplement, Vol. III. Ch. xvii. § 3.

the Epiſtle is written in Greek) who ſpake the Greek language. The queſtion however ſtill remains to be aſked; Did he addreſs it to Jews in general, including unbelievers as well as believers, or only to thoſe, who were already converted?

Many writers, among whom is Lardner[g], have adopted the former opinion. Now this opinion would be thought very extraordinary, if it were not in ſome meaſure countenanced by the character, which has been given of James, the brother of Jeſus, whom Lardner conſiders as the ſame with the younger Apoſtle James. For a writer, who was the head of the Chriſtian church in Jeruſalem, or an Apoſtle of Chriſt, could hardly expect that an Epiſtle full of exhortations would have influence on the conduct of unbelieving Jews. And if he had thought it neceſſary to write to men of this deſcription, we might have expected, that he would endeavour to convince them of the truth of Chriſtianity, rather than admoniſh and reprimand them in the tone of an eſtabliſhed teacher. But, as I have already obſerved, the character of St. James makes the opinion leſs improbable, and renders it worthy of examination.

Some of the arguments, which have been alleged in its ſupport, are however incapable of defence. For inſtance, appeal has been made to ch. v. 1—6. where St. James ſays, 'Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for the miſeries, that ſhall come upon you, &c.'; and hence it has been inferred, that St. James addreſſed himſelf to perſons, who were not Chriſtians. Now this argument reſts entirely on the ſuppoſition, that none of the primitive Chriſtians could have deſerved this cenſure, and that they were all in a ſtate of perfect regeneration, a ſuppoſition, which is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the deſcription, which St. Paul has given of the Corinthians in his two Epiſtles to them. It will be ſaid perhaps in reply, that St. James could hardly mean Chriſtians, when he wrote ver. 6. 'Ye have killed the juſt one.' But are there no examples of impious Chriſtians, as well as of

[g] Supplement, Vol. III. Ch. xviii. § 3.

of impious Jews, and are there not murderers among the former, as well as among the latter? In this paſſage however, I would not underſtand the word 'kill' in its literal ſenſe, becauſe both Chriſtians and Jews were ſubject to the Roman laws, and could not take away the life of another, without forfeiting their own. I would aſcribe to it therefore the ſenſe of, 'to take away from another all that he has,' in the ſame manner as Cicero has uſed it in his Oration for Quintius [h], though with a variation in the words and expreſſions. Beſides, it is really a matter of doubt, whether St. James in ch. v. 6. though he there ſpeaks in the ſecond perſon, meant thoſe to whom he was writing. He made uſe perhaps of the figure called Apoſtrophe, and thus addreſſed the rich in ver. 6. in order to repreſent in more lively colours the conſolation, which he adminiſters to the poor in the next verſe. It is true, that this figure is not very ſuitable to the familiar epiſtolary ſtyle: but the Epiſtle of St. James has in many other places terms of expreſſion, which are more uſual in poetry than in letter-writing.

Another argument for the opinion, that the Epiſtle of St. James was addreſſed to unbelieving, as well as to believing Jews, is derived from the circumſtance, that St. James warns his readers againſt groſs and ungodly behaviour. But if this argument proved any thing, it would prove too much: for it would prove with equal force, that the two Epiſtles to the Corinthians were not written to Chriſtians.

The

[h] Examine the following expreſſions in this oration, in their connexion with the queſtion of law, which was the ſubject of debate. C. 2. quorum in alterius manu vita poſita eſt, and in the ſame chapter, qui caput alterius, famam, fortunaſque omnes defendam. C. 7. iſte caput petere non deſinebat, that is, the object of the proſecution was to obtain, not a certain ſum, but the whole fortune of Quintius. C. 8. ſe de capite ſuo priore loco cauſam dicturum. C. 9. 11. ſanguinem vitamque eripere, interficere. C. 12. 13. ne numeretur inter vivos? decernat de vita et ornamentis ſuis omnibus?—jugulare—contra caput dicere—ut hominis propinqui caput incolume eſſe patiamur: and many other expreſſions of the ſame kind in C. 14, 15, 16. 22. 29. 31.

The only argument of any conſequence is, that St. James addreſſes his Epiſtle in general terms, ch. i. 1. 'to the twelve tribes which are ſcattered abroad,' without any reſtricting clauſe, which might confine the meaning to believers only: and that in ch. ii. 2. he calls their place of public worſhip by the name of συναγωγη, which denotes not a Chriſtian, but a Jewiſh aſſembly. However to this argument may be oppoſed others, which are more deciſive on the other ſide of the queſtion.

1. St. James ſays, ch. i. 3. 'the trying of your faith worketh patience.' He could hardly mean any other than Chriſtian faith: for though the Jews, who believed in Moſes, had their ſufferings, as well as they who believed in Chriſt, yet the ſufferings of the Jews in the time of St. James could not be called trials of their faith, becauſe no one compelled them to renounce it. But the caſe of the Chriſtians was different; for they really had trials of their faith, ſince the perſecutions, which they underwent, were on account of their faith.

2. In ch. ii. 1. St. James ſpeaks in expreſs terms of faith in Jeſus Chriſt, which he cautions his readers not to hold εν προσωποληψιαις της δοξης[1]. Now this admonition neceſſarily implies that his readers already believed in Chriſt, at leaſt to all outward appearance, or St. James could not have cautioned them againſt an abuſe of their faith in Chriſt.

It is certain therefore that St. James wrote to perſons, who were already converted from Judaiſm to Chriſtianity. At the ſame time I believe, as St. James was highly reſpected by the Jews in general, that it was his wiſh and intention, that unbelieving Jews alſo ſhould read it, and be converted, and that this wiſh and intention had ſome influence on the choice of his materials.

[1] I here uſe the words of the original, becauſe I think the common tranſlation faulty.

SECT. V.

Of the contents of this Epiſtle.

FROM the character, which Hegeſippus has given of St. James, though his deſcription is highly exaggerated, it appears that St. James was more a moraliſt, than a dogmatiſt: and this character is viſible throughout the whole of his Epiſtle, which contains rather moral precepts, than points of doctrine. It is extraordinary, that on this very account ſome commentators have objected to the Epiſtle, and doubted of its divine inſpiration. Luther for this reaſon called it an Epiſtle of ſtraw: but we might with equal reaſon apply this term to Chriſt's ſermon on the mount. The moral part of the New Teſtament is neceſſary, as well as the doctrinal: and an Epiſtle is not to be deſpiſed, becauſe it is chiefly moral, and contains no diſquiſitions on the death and ſacrifice of Chriſt.

In each of St. Paul's Epiſtles the former part is for the moſt part doctrinal, and only the latter part exhortatory. On the contrary, where St. James has introduced points of doctrine, as for inſtance, that God is not the cauſe of our temptation to evil, or that faith without works is inſufficient for ſalvation, he does it only occaſionally, and by way of illuſtration. I conclude therefore that in the ſcattered communities, for which he deſigned his Epiſtle, no material errors generally prevailed: for in this caſe St. James would have had the ſame motive for writing on points of doctrine, as St. Paul and other Apoſtles, who were induced to be explicit on doctrinal matters, becauſe errors on theſe ſubjects prevailed in the communities, to which they wrote. That St. James has no where taught the abolition of the Levitical law[k], is to be aſcribed to the circumſtance, that he addreſſed

[k] He ſpeaks indeed Ch. i. 25. ii. 12. of the 'law of liberty:' but this cannot be conſtrued into an aſſertion that the Levitical law ceaſed to be in force.

addreſſed his Epiſtle to native Jews, who were permitted to retain the laws and cuſtoms of their anceſtors, till they dwindled away of themſelves. That he has no where even mentioned the duties, which Jewiſh converts owe to heathen converts in the Chriſtian church; I have already obſerved in the ſecond ſection of this chapter, where I deduced from this omiſſion an argument in favour of the early date of this Epiſtle.

The precepts and exhortations, which are arranged, not ſyſtematically, but ſo as they occaſionally occurred to the writer, may be reduced to the following heads.

1. St. James exhorts his readers, to bear with patience the misfortunes and perſecutions, which they endured on account of their faith: and cautions them not to murmur againſt God, or to aſcribe to him their temptations to a renunciation of their faith, ch. i. 2—21. The ſix laſt verſes of this chapter, which may be ſummed up in the following words, 'if ye know theſe things, happy are ye, if ye do them,' form the concluſion of this exhortation.

2. In the next place he exhorts them to a contempt of riches (on which ſubject he had briefly touched, ch. i. 11, 12), as being the ſureſt means of fortifying themſelves againſt affliction. He knew probably that the Jews, to whom he wrote, ſet a high value on riches, and conſidered worldly proſperity as a mark of divine favour. He warns them therefore, not to be admirers of a brilliant exterior, nor to imagine, that wealth and honours are alone worthy of eſteem, which he probably means by προσωπολημψιαι της δοξης, ch. ii. 1. And, to render this precept more intelligible, he ſuppoſes the caſe of two ſtrangers coming at the ſame time into the ſynagogue, the one poorly, the other richly dreſſed [1]. If the value of their clothes determined the reſpect to be paid to them, the one might be treated with much leſs, the other with much greater honour than he deſerved. The poor man might be a valuable and ſincere member of the Chriſtian church, and though indigent in this world,

[1] Ch. ii. 2—9.

world, might be deſtined to be rich in the world to come. The rich man on the contrary might be an enemy of the Chriſtians, an oppreſſor of the poor, and might have viſited the ſynagogue, not to ſet an example of devotion, but merely to gratify his curioſity, or perhaps to find an object for the exerciſe of his ridicule[m]. St. James then proceeds, ch. ii. 10—26. to ſome general reflexions on the neceſſity of acting agreeably to our conviction, and aſſerts, that whoever wilfully tranſgreſſes one point of the law, ſhews a contempt for the whole law. This leads him to the conſideration of the neceſſity of good works in general: and he concludes by ſaying, that faith without works is like a body without a ſoul[n].

In the fourth chapter he reſumes the ſubject of love for worldly poſſeſſions and enjoyments, and cenſures thoſe, who form to themſelves imaginary ſchemes of happineſs, without conſidering, that every thing depends on the will of providence, and that all their plans may be defeated in a moment[o]. This conſideration leads him, ch. v. 1—6. to addreſs the rich, who are too frequently oppreſſors of the poor, in ſevere, and at the ſame time poetical, language. The whole paſſage is a kind of apoſtrophe; for he addreſſes and threatens thoſe, to whom he does not immediately write. In ver. 7—11. he returns from the rich to the poor, whom he comforts, and exhorts to bear adverſity with patience.

I believe likewiſe that the 12th verſe of the fifth chapter (which appears to be a fragment of Chriſt's ſermon on the mount) belongs to the ſame ſubject, and that it is connected with ch. iv. 13, 14. where St. James had ſaid, 'Go to now, ye that ſay, to day or to morrow we

[m] We muſt not however ſuppoſe that St. James meant to give rules for the arrangement of ſeats in a Chriſtian church, and that a diſtinction of ranks is unlawful.

[n] It muſt be obſerved that St. James's doctrine, relative to faith and works, is introduced only in an illuſtration of the preceding diſcourſe. But many commentators, not attending to the occaſion of its introduction, have taken it for an eſſential part of this Epiſtle.

[o] Ch. iv. 13—17.

we will go into ſuch a city, and continue there a year, and buy and ſell and get gain, whereas ye know not, what ſhall be on the morrow.' If this ſuppoſition be true, ch. v. 12. contains not a prohibition of ſerious oaths, by which we bind ourſelves to the performance of certain duties, but only of wanton oaths, by which we endeavour in common converſation to give energy to an aſſertion, that we will do this or that, that we will go to this or that city, &c. St. James then concludes, ch. v. 13—18. with an exhortation to confide in the Supreme Being, whether in proſperity or in adverſity [p].

3. In the third chapter St. James cenſures the great deſire, which many had to teach publicly in the place of worſhip. This muſt not be underſtood of a deſire to obtain the office of a miniſter or biſhop, for this explanation renders the paſſage obſcure. We muſt make a diſtinction between holding an eccleſiaſtical office, and teaching in the place of public worſhip, for among the Jews, and likewiſe among the primitive Chriſtians, the latter did not neceſſarily imply the former. In the Jewiſh ſynagogues, after a chapter had been read from the Bible, every man who had ſufficient learning and ability, was permitted to expound and to exhort: and the ſame cuſtom prevailed in the primitive church. St. James therefore warns his readers againſt the abuſe of this liberty, and adviſes them to be cautious how they ſpake in public, becauſe it was extremely difficult to perform this taſk with propriety. St. James had probably been informed, that many of thoſe who were ſo forward to deliver their ſentiments, harangued only to gratify their vanity, and that they cenſured others, not ſo much to promote piety, as to gratify private hatred and envy. For this reaſon, after having cenſured the abuſes of public ſpeaking, he proceeds to the ſource of thoſe abuſes,

[p] What St. James ſays ver. 14. relative to the anointing of the ſick, I do not think neceſſary to explain at preſent: and I will only obſerve, that he uſed perhaps the word αλειφω, not merely in the confined ſenſe of anointing, but in the more extenſive ſenſe of adminiſtering medicine in general.

abuſes, namely, hatred and envy: and concludes, ch. iv. 11, 12. with an exhortation, not to calumniate and unjuſtly judge our brethren.

Whether the Jewiſh converts, to whom St. James wrote his Epiſtle, had places of worſhip apart from the ſynagogue, and in theſe places the abuſes prevailed, which St. James cenſures; or whether they ſtill met in the ſynagogue, and certain Chriſtians abuſed the privilege of ſpeaking, ſo as to create diſorder, is a queſtion, which has not yet been examined, and which I propoſe for future conſideration. The latter is at leaſt not impoſſible: for it appears from the Acts of the Apoſtles, that in the age, in which the Epiſtle of St. James was written, Chriſtians, and even the Apoſtles themſelves, were permitted to teach in the Jewiſh ſynagogues.

I will conclude this ſection with the following remarks.

1. Though St. James lived in Jeruſalem, he has quoted the Old Teſtament, not according to the Hebrew text, but according to the Septuagint, whence it appears that he was very converſant with the Greek Bible. However there is one paſſage, namely, that quoted in Ch. iv. 5. which has not yet been diſcovered in the Septuagint. I formerly made an attempt in my Latin notes to this Epiſtle to point out the place: but I now perceive that the attempt was unſucceſsful.

2. The ſtyle of this Epiſtle is not more unclaſſical, than that of other books of the New Teſtament; and the thoughts, eſpecially ſuch as are figurative, are elegant and lively, ſo that St. James appears to have been endued with a poetical genius.

3. The language is more figurative, than that of a Greek Epiſtle written by a claſſic author would be. It is ſometimes poetical, ſometimes oratorical, and has the uſual marks of oriental compoſition.

4. There occur ſometimes words, which a correct Greek writer would not have uſed in thoſe places, for inſtance πορειαι [9], ch. i. 11. and βαληθεις, ch. i. 18. This

[9] Here St. James uſes this word to denote career, or courſe of life, in which ſenſe it is not uſed even in the Septuagint.

This perhaps may be aſcribed to the circumſtance, that the author was not much accuſtomed to write Greek.

5. The materials are not methodically arranged: there are frequent tranſitions from one ſubject to another: and even where the ſame ſubject is continued, the connexion of one period with another is not always obvious. Sometimes St. James quits a ſubject, which he appears to have finiſhed, and after he has diſcuſſed ſome other topic returns to the ſubject, which he had before quitted. This arrangement is very different from that of St. Paul's Epiſtles.

6. It is remarkable, that in this ſhort Epiſtle two paſſages occur, which are perfect hexameters, namely in ch. i. 17. iv. 4. Was St. James, who lived in Paleſtine, accuſtomed to read Greek verſes: did he quote from Chriſtian hymns in the Greek language: or what was the origin of theſe hexameters?

7. Wetſtein in his Note to ch. iv. 5. has drawn a parallel between ſeveral paſſages in this Epiſtle, and paſſages in the Wiſdom of Solomon, which in Wetſtein's opinion warrant the concluſion that St. James borrowed from this book. I wiſh that this queſtion were examined more minutely, eſpecially as I have hardly ever met with a paſſage in other parts of the New Teſtament, which was taken from the Wiſdom of Solomon. However, it is not improbable, that St. James, as he lived in Jeruſalem, where Chaldee was ſpoken, endeavoured to familiariſe himſelf with the Greek language by ſtudying the Greek Apocrypha more diligently, than the other writers of the New Teſtament appear to have done [r].

[r] Compare Ch. i. 19. with Eccleſiaſticus v. 11.

SECT. VI.

Whether St. James's doctrine, concerning faith and works, contradicts St. Paul's doctrine of faith without works.

ST. PAUL in his Epiſtle to the Romans, ch. iii. 28. aſſerts, 'that a man is juſtified by faith, without the deeds of the law:' and this doctrine he delivers in many other places. St. James, on the contrary, aſſerts, ch. ii. 17. 20. 'that faith without works is dead,' and ver. 22. ſays that 'Abraham our father was juſtified by works.' The queſtion therefore is, how are theſe aſſertions, which apparently contradict each other, to be reconciled? The uſual methods of reconciling them I think are unſatisfactory, becauſe they aſcribe to the words of St. Paul and St. James meanings, of which they are hardly capable. But the contradiction will vaniſh immediately, if we only attend to the different ſenſes, in which the two writers have uſed the words 'faith,' and 'juſtification.'

When St. Paul aſſerts, that we are juſtified by faith, it is evident that he means faith in the death and ſacrifice of Chriſt. He has fully explained his own meaning in the very chapter, from which the preceding quotation was made. For he ſays, Rom. iii. 22. 'the righteouſneſs of God, which is by faith of Jeſus Chriſt:' ver. 25. 'whom God hath ſet forth, to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood:' and ver. 26. 'that he might be juſt, and the juſtifier of him, which believeth in Jeſus.'

St. James, on the contrary, in the place, where he has been ſuppoſed to differ from St. Paul, does not ſpeak of faith in Chriſt, and his ſacrifice, but of faith in the one true God *. This appears from ch. ii. 19. where he ſays

* I do not mean to ſay that St. James has in no part of his Epiſtle ſpoken of faith in Chriſt, for he ſpeaks of it in expreſs terms, Ch. ii. 1. I mean only to aſſert, that in that particular place, with which we are now concerned, he does not mean faith in Chriſt.

ſays 'thou believeſt that there is one God; thou doeſt well: the devils alſo believe and tremble.' This example St. James quotes, as a proof that a belief alone in the one true God is not ſufficient for ſalvation. We ſhall more clearly perceive the meaning of St. James, and the force of his proof, if we recollect, that according to the Jewiſh notions of idolatry, which St. Paul had delivered, 1 Cor. x. 19, 20, 21. devils or evils ſpirits were worſhipped in the gods of the heathens. For the heathens conſidered their gods only as intermediate ſpirits between themſelves and the infinite eternal Being, who was above all things: and they likewiſe called their gods δαιμονια. But ſpirits, who ſuffer themſelves to be adored by men, muſt be evil ſpirits, and diſobedient to the Supreme Being, to whom alone adoration is due. Now theſe evil ſpirits, or devils, ſays St. James, though they are worſhipped as gods, are convinced, that there is only one God: they have in this reſpect as much faith as Abraham; but their works do not harmonize with their faith, ſince they take delight in being worſhipped by men. Their faith therefore in the one true God, inſtead of procuring them happineſs, tends only to their condemnation: and they tremble before that God, who will annihilate their aſſumed divinity, and puniſh them for being the ſeducers of mankind.

That men are juſtified by faith in the one true God, and that every Jew, who believed in this fundamental article, would be ſaved, is a doctrine, which St. Paul has never delivered. But ſome perſons, who were known to St. James, muſt have taught this doctrine, or he would not have taken ſo much pains to confute it: and theſe perſons were certainly Jews[t], not diſciples of St. Paul. For Jewiſh writers in their comments on Gen. xv. 6. and likewiſe on other occaſions, aſſert, that they obtained ſalvation-

[t] To quote paſſages from Rabbinic writings would be ſuperfluous: but I will quote one from the works of Philo, who was a contemporary of St. James, Tom. II. p. 442. Mangey. 'Therefore he is ſaid to have been the firſt, who believed in God: for he was the firſt, who maintained the firm and unchangeable poſition, that there is *one* ſupreme cauſe, which protects the world and every thing in the world.'

ſalvation by faith [u]; but the faith, of which they ſpeak, is only faith in the one true God, or at the utmoſt, faith alſo in a future ſtate. Now St. James, in denying that this faith, if unaccompanied by works, would procure ſalvation, has ſaid nothing more than St. Paul himſelf has ſaid, though in other words, in the ſecond chapter of his Epiſtle to the Romans, where he combats the ſame Jewiſh error, and aſſerts, that not the hearers, but the doers only of the law will be juſtified, and that a knowledge of God's will without the performance of it, ſerves only to increaſe our condemnation.

Further the word 'juſtification,' which is a very material term in the two ſuppoſed contradictory doctrines, is uſed by St. James in a different ſenſe from that in which it is uſed by St. Paul. In the third chapter of the Epiſtle to the Romans, where St. Paul ſays that we are juſtified through faith in Chriſt, he uſes the term 'juſtified' to denote 'pronounced juſt and exempt from puniſhment, or pardoned in reſpect to our former ſins.' Now it is evident, that if we have treſpaſſed in the former part of our lives, ſubſequent good works, which it is our duty at all times to perform, will not render us innocent in reſpect to our paſt offences, and indeed no human court of Juſtice would admit of this plea. Equally evident is it, that the works of the Levitical law, ſuch as the offering of animals, cannot produce a remiſſion of ſins, or juſtification, in St. Paul's ſenſe of the word. But this term may be uſed in other ſenſes, though we are accuſtomed in our ſyſtems of divinity to give it that ſenſe only, which was aſcribed to it by St. Paul. For inſtance, juſtification may denote a declaration of the Deity that a particular perſon is morally good, virtuous, and holy: as it is ſaid of Job, that he was no hypocrite, that he had not his equal on earth,

[u] Mohammed likewiſe has taught this doctrine, which he learnt from the Jews. The Koran promiſes eternal ſalvation to the faithful. Now by the faithful, in the Koran, are underſtood they who believe in the unity of the Godhead, and in the reſurrection of the dead: and by the unfaithful, they who deny theſe articles.

earth, that he feared God, and fled from evil. And that St. James really uſed the word juſtification in this ſenſe appears from what he adds, ch. ii. 23. 'and he was called the friend of God.' Now if we take the term juſtification in this ſenſe, it is clear that Abraham's juſtification muſt be aſcribed, not to his faith only, but likewiſe to his works, as St. James aſſerts, ch. ii. 21—23. For if Abraham, with all his faith in God, had refuſed to offer his ſon Iſaac, he would not have been juſtified. And on the other hand, works alone without faith would not have juſtified him. For, if he had offered his ſon without faith in God, without believing in God's infinite power, and ability to raiſe Iſaac from the dead, he would not only have been a murderer, and a defiler of the altar, but in his heart muſt have accuſed God of a violation of his word, in firſt promiſing to bleſs Iſaac's poſterity, and then commanding him to be ſacrificed before he had children.

From what has been already ſaid in this ſection, it appears, that it was by no means St. James's intention, as many ſuppoſe, to prevent St. Paul's doctrine on the efficacy of faith from being falſely underſtood: for it is not a miſinterpretation of St. Paul's doctrine, againſt which St. James argues, but an erroneous doctrine of the Jews, which St. Paul combats, as well as St. James. Nor is the confutation of this doctrine the principal object of the Epiſtle, for St. James introduces it merely to enforce what he had ſaid relative to certain offences, ſuch as complaining againſt God, and oppreſſing the poor; and to convince his readers, that a knowledge of the law, if they did not follow it, would not avail them. In fact the ſuppoſition, that St. James intended to prevent a miſinterpretation of St. Paul's doctrine is, in itſelf almoſt incredible: for no man, whoſe object was merely to prevent the doctrine of another from being falſely underſtood, would expreſs himſelf in ſuch a manner, that his readers might ſuppoſe he meant to combat the doctrine itſelf. Whoever ſubſcribes to the doctrine advanced by another, but is apprehenſive that it may be

falſely underſtood, will limit and explain that doctrine; and will not make uſe of terms, which have the appearance, rather of a confutation, than of an explanation. But whether the author of this Epiſtle was the elder or the younger James, I think no one, who has read the Acts of the Apoſtles, can ſuppoſe, that he meant really to combat St. Paul's doctrine, and that he deſignedly made uſe of expreſſions, which might counteract what St. Paul had aſſerted.

Laſtly, I think it highly probable, that St. James, when he wrote his Epiſtle, had not ſeen St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Romans. For if he had, he would probably have delivered his doctrine relative to faith and works in other words, and would have avoided the uſe of terms, which St. Paul had adopted in his doctrine of faith without works: ſince he muſt have been aware, that the uſe of the ſame terms would unavoidably create at leaſt an apparent contradiction to the doctrine of St. Paul.

SECT. VII.

Of the time, when the Epiſtle of St. James was written.

MOST commentators[w] ſuppoſe that this Epiſtle was written about the year 60 or 61. But the arguments, which have been advanced in favour of this late date, are very unſtable. Appeal has been made to ch. iv. 4—6. where St. James is ſaid to have quoted from Rom. viii. 6. 7. Gal. v. 6. and 1 Pet. v. 5: and thence it has been inferred, that this Epiſtle was written later, than St. Paul's Epiſtles to the Romans and the Galatians,

[w] See for inſtance Jo. Henr. Michaelis Introd. in Ep. Jacobi, § 8. Millii Prolegomena, § 56. and Lardner's Supplement, Vol. III. Ch. xvii. § 2.

Galatians, and the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter. But one of the two paſſages, which St. James quotes, ch. iv. 4—6: is in the Old Teſtament, in Prov. iii. 24. from which place St. James probably took it: and the other quotation, which has not yet been diſcovered in the Old Teſtament, could not have been made either from the Epiſtle to the Romans, or from that to the Galatians, for I have never been able to find the paſſage in either of them. Another argument in favour of a late date is derived from the ſuppoſition that St. James intended to prevent a miſconſtruction of St. Paul's doctrine of faith in the Epiſtle to the Romans: but, as I have ſhewn in the preceding ſection, that this ſuppoſition is falſe, the inference derived from it falls of itſelf to the ground. A third argument has been derived from ch. v. 8.: but this I have already anſwered in the ſecond ſection of this chapter.

In fact, the arguments, which I have uſed in the latter part of the ſecond ſection, render it probable that the Epiſtle was written long before the Epiſtle to the Romans, and even before St. Paul had preached the Goſpel to the Gentiles; ſince it was addreſſed to Jews, and no mention is made in it of brotherly love toward Gentile converts. I conclude therefore, that this was written before the events, which are recorded in Acts xiii., took place, and even before the death of the elder James, whether he, or the younger James was the author of it.

The only objection to this early date is, that St. Paul, if he had written his Epiſtle to the Romans, after the Epiſtle of St. James had been written, would have avoided in the third and fourth chapters an appearance of contradiction to St. James. But as the Epiſtle of St. James was ſent perhaps to the Jews of Egypt, Cyrene, Syria, and Cyprus, countries in which the Chriſtian religion was ſoon propagated, it was probably unknown in Rome, when St. Paul wrote to the Romans, and therefore he had no reaſon to apprehend that the Romans would ſuppoſe he contradicted St. James:

and if they did ſuppoſe ſo, a more minute examination muſt convince them, that the contradiction was only apparent, and that St. Paul ſpake of faith in the death and ſacrifice of Chriſt, but St. James of faith in the one true God. Or the Epiſtle of St. James, though it exiſted when St. Paul wrote to the Romans, might have remained unknown to him.

They who aſcribe the Epiſtle to the elder James, of courſe agree with me in reſpect to its early date. Bede[x] likewiſe, though he aſcribes it to the James, of whom St. Paul ſpeaks, Gal. ii. 12. is ſtill of opinion that it was written ſoon after the death of the martyr Stephen, and addreſſed to thoſe converts, of whom it is ſaid, Acts viii. 4. that they were ſcattered abroad.

SECT. VIII.

Of the canonical authority of this Epiſtle.

ON the canonical authority of this Epiſtle the ancients were very much divided; nor do modern writers agree on this ſubject. I confeſs likewiſe, that I myſelf am greatly in doubt, though I conſider the queſtion in a different light from moſt other authors. But before I deliver my own ſentiments, I will ſtate and examine what has been advanced on this head, both in ancient, and in modern times.

In the earlieſt ages of Chriſtianity the Epiſtle was rejected by many, not only as uncanonical, but as ſpurious. Euſebius in the celebrated chapter of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, B. III. ch. 25. where he treats of the writings of the New Teſtament, which he divides into ὁμολογουμενα, αντιλεγομενα, and νοθα, places the Epiſtle of St.

[x] In his Expoſition of the Epiſtle of St. James, Ch. i. 1. Vol. V. p. 673. of the Cologne edition of his works.

St. James in the ſecond claſs, ſaying; 'among the controverted, but yet approved by many, are, the Epiſtle aſcribed to James, and that of Jude, and the ſecond of Peter, and the ſecond and third of John.' And in B. II. ch. 23. where Euſebius ſpeaks of the James, who was ſtoned to death at the inſtigation of Ananus, he ſays toward the end of the chapter, 'It is reported that the firſt among the Catholic Epiſtles, as they are called, was written by him. But it muſt be obſerved that this Epiſtle is now conſidered as ſpurious; for not many ancient writers have noticed it, any more than the Epiſtle of Jude, which is another of the ſeven Epiſtles called Catholic. We know however that theſe alſo, together with the reſt, are publicly read in moſt churches.' From theſe two paſſages it appears that Euſebius himſelf doubted, whether the Epiſtle was genuine. Jerom alſo ſeems to have remained in doubt, though he does not deny the opinion which others entertained of its ſpuriouſneſs. For he ſays in his catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers[y], 'Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Juſtus—unam tantum ſcripſit epiſtolam, quæ de catholicis eſt; quæ et ipſa ab alio quodam ſub nomine ejus edita aſſeritur, licet paullatim, tempore procedente, obtinuerit autoritatem.' From this confeſſion of Jerom we ſee, that the Epiſtle was in much leſs repute in the ſecond and third centuries, than at the end of the fourth. The eccleſiaſtical writers before the time of Euſebius, as well thoſe who have noticed, as thoſe who have not noticed this Epiſtle, are enumerated by Lardner, in his Supplement to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, Vol. III. ch. 17.: whence it appears, that, if we except a few uncertain and only imaginary alluſions, the Epiſtle is not quoted in a ſingle inſtance either by Irenæus, Tertullian, or Clement of Alexandria, that it is quoted twice by Origen, though only as a book of uncertain authority, and in both places in reference to the doctrine, that faith without works is dead. And that Origen's doubts in reſpect to this Epiſtle did not proceed

[y] Tom. IV. P. II. p. 102. ed. Benedict.

proceed from any objection to its contents, will appear from his own words which I will ſubjoin in the margin [z].

Here I beg leave to make the following remarks.

1. As the ancients are ſo divided in regard to this Epiſtle, its canonical authority cannot be founded on the teſtimony of the church, which indeed can in no queſtion of this kind be conſidered as deciſive [a]. In fact, the teſtimony of the moſt ancient Chriſtian church, according to the repreſentation of Euſebius, if it decided any thing, would decide againſt the canonical authority of this Epiſtle.

2. Though Euſebius places the Epiſtle of St. James in the ſame claſs with that of St. Jude, the ſecond of St. Peter, and the ſecond and third of St. John, it has in ſome reſpects a better claim to canonical authority, than theſe. For neither of theſe four laſt mentioned Epiſtles were admitted into the Syrian canon, but the Epiſtle of St. James was admitted into it, and the Syriac verſion of this Epiſtle appears to have been made by the ſame perſon, who tranſlated the other Epiſtles; at leaſt no difference of ſtyle has hitherto been diſcovered, as in the tranſlation of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews [b]. We muſt conclude therefore that, when the Syriac verſion was made, which was at the cloſe of the firſt century, the tranſlator found this Epiſtle in the Greek collection of canonical writings, and that the Syrian church received it as canonical, with the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter and the firſt of St. John. And this authority it conſtantly retained in the Syrian church: for Ebed Jeſu, a Syrian writer

[z] Comment. in Iohannem. Tom. XIX. p. 284. ed. Colon. 'But if that be called faith, it is dead without works, as we read in the Epiſtle, which is ſuppoſed to have been written by James (εν τη φερομενη Ιακωβου αναγνωμεν). And Tom. XXI. in his obſervations on Joh. viii. 39. p. 294. he ſays, 'Even if it is granted that faith is a work, which however will not be granted by thoſe who admit the paſſage, *faith without works is dead*' (ει συγχωρηθειη αν υπο των παραδεχομενων το, Πιστις χωρις εργων νεκρα εστι), &c.

[a] See what was ſaid on this ſubject, in the firſt volume of this Introduction, Ch. iii. Sect. 2.

[b] See Vol. I. Ch. vii. Sect. 2.

writer of the thirteenth century, in his catalogue of the books of the New Teſtament, diſtinguiſhes theſe three from the other four, by calling them 'the three Epiſtles, which are aſcribed to Apoſtles in all books[c] and in all languages[d].' Ephrem, a Syrian writer of the fourth century, has in ſeveral paſſages of his Greek works quoted the Epiſtle of St. James, two of which I will tranſcribe, becauſe they ſhew that Ephrem conſidered this Epiſtle as holy ſcripture, and as written by James the brother of the Lord, Tom. I. p. 18. ειρηκε γαρ ἡ θεια γραφη· Εξομολογειϲθε αλληλοις τας ἁμαρτιας, και προϲευχεϲθε ὑπερ αλληλων, ὁπως ιαθητε[e]. Tom. III. p. 51. Ιακωβος δε ὁ τȣ κυριȣ αδελφος λεγει· Πειθηϲατε και κλαυϲατε, ὁ γελως ὑμων εις πενθος μεταϲραφητω, και ἡ χαρα εις κατηφειαν[f].

3. The circumſtance, which in my opinion makes it doubtful, whether the Epiſtle of St. James ought to be received as canonical, namely, the want of certainty that the author was an Apoſtle, appears, as far as I have been able to diſcover, to have had no influence on the judgement of ancient writers on this ſubject; which is the more extraordinary, becauſe on that very ground they doubted whether the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was a divine work. If we may judge from the repreſentations of

[c] He means MSS. of the N. T.

[d] In the preceding edition of this Introduction I obſerved, that, if the Manicheans, according to Beauſobre Hiſtoire des Manichéens, Tom. I. p. 292, 293., received the Epiſtle of St. James, it might probably be aſcribed to the circumſtance, that the Epiſtle was received by the Syrian church, which was extended over a great part of the Eaſt. In confirmation of this aſſertion may be added, that the Manicheans in general did not underſtand Greek, but that they underſtood Syriac: conſequently, they read the Syriac and not the Greek New Teſtament. However, leſt the circumſtance that this Epiſtle was received by the Manicheans ſhould appear of greater weight than it really is, I will add the words of Auguſtin (contra Fauſtum L. XXXII. c. 15), becauſe they do not diſtinguiſh the three Catholic Epiſtles, which the Syrian church received, from the four which it rejected: quod quidem in Evangelio, vel in Epiſtolis Canonicis, quo adjuvari hæreſin ſuam putent, id eſſe a Chriſto et Apoſtolis dictum teneant.

[e] This is a quotation from James v. 16.

[f] James iv. 9.

of Euſebius and Jerom, they who rejected the Epiſtle, rejected it becauſe they believed it to be ſpurious.

Now I wiſh that Euſebius and Jerom had mentioned what reaſons they, who rejected this Epiſtle, had for ſuppoſing that it was ſpurious, or a forgery in the name of James the brother of Chriſt. The Epiſtle itſelf contains no marks whatſoever of ſpuriouſneſs, whether we conſider its contents, or its language: and whichever of the three ſuppoſitions we adopt, that it was written by the elder Apoſtle James, or by the younger Apoſtle James, or by James the brother of Chriſt, the ſuppoſition will by no means involve an abſurdity. Beſides, it is difficult to comprehend, what motive could have induced an impoſtor to forge ſuch an Epiſtle, and aſcribe it to either of theſe three perſons.

It may be aſked, whether the apparent contradiction between the doctrine contained in this Epiſtle, and that of St. Paul, in reſpect to the efficacy of faith, did not induce the ancients to reject it, and pronounce it ſpurious. But I much doubt whether this was the cauſe of its rejection, ſince no ancient writer who ſpeaks doubtfully of the Epiſtle, aſſigns this apparent contradiction as a reaſon for doubting of its authenticity: and Origen in particular, as I have already obſerved, appears to have had no objection whatſoever to the doctrines contained in it. If however this apparent contradiction was really the cauſe of its rejection, it was rejected without reaſon, as appears from what has been ſaid in the ſixth ſection. Nay, what is ſtill more, this apparent contradiction may be alleged as an argument in favour of its antiquity and authenticity. For had it been fabricated by a Chriſtian impoſtor after the Apoſtolic age, at a time when the Epiſtle to the Romans was known in general to the Chriſtian communities, the impoſtor would have taken care to avoid even the ſmalleſt appearance of contradiction to an Epiſtle, which every Chriſtian received as divine. Beſides, if the Epiſtle had been written after the Apoſtolic age, it could hardly have occurred to the author to combat the Jewiſh doctrine, that faith in the

one true God was alone ſufficient for ſalvation. And, ſince it is directed immediately to Jews, the author of it, if he had meant to exerciſe a pious fraud, and promote the cauſe of Chriſtianity by inventing an Epiſtle in the name of St. James, would ſurely have introduced ſome arguments for the truth of the Chriſtian religion, or have at leaſt exhorted them to embrace it: but of ſuch arguments and exhortations the Epiſtle contains no traces. I have no doubt therefore that it is ancient and genuine.

Later critics who have objected to this Epiſtle, and have thought it undeſerving a place in the ſacred canon, have grounded their objections merely on its contents. Now this is a very precarious mode of determining whether a book is canonical: for when we have a divine revelation, we muſt believe and do what it contains, and not expunge any part of it, merely becauſe that part diſpleaſes us. But I think there is no ground whatſoever for being diſpleaſed with the Epiſtle of St. James, and in my opinion its contents are highly rational and well worthy of an Apoſtle. The only difficulty is to prove that an Apoſtle was the author. That its contents are more moral than doctrinal, cannot ſurely form a ſerious ground for objection: and the epithet which Luther very unjuſtly applied to it, might as well be applied to the ſermon on the mount. That the members of the church of Rome prove their doctrine of confeſſion and extreme unction from ch. v. 14—16. is no reaſon, why proteſtants ſhould reject this Epiſtle: for in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of moſt proteſtant commentators, this paſſage does not contain any ſuch doctrine. At the time when this Epiſtle was written, the practice of phyſic was attended with great ſuperſtition: and conſcientious Jews were apprehenſive that, if they ſent for an heathen phyſician, he would either invoke ſome idol in the adminiſtration of his medicines, or exerciſe magic arts. The author of this Epiſtle therefore adviſes thoſe, who are ſick, to ſend for the elders of the church, that they may pray over the

the medicines, and then adminiſter them to the ſick. In like manner St. Paul ſays, that, if they who partake of the fleſh of animals offered to idols, pray over it, and thank God for his bounty, they may partake of it with a good conſcience.

The contents therefore of this Epiſtle afford no ground whatſoever for objecting to it: and the queſtion, whether it is canonical, that is, whether we ought to receive it as a divine and infallible work, muſt, according to the principles which I have laid down in Vol. I. ch. iii. ſect. 12. depend on the previous queſtion, whether the author was an Apoſtle. If the James who wrote this Epiſtle, was either the elder Apoſtle James, the ſon of Zebedee, or the younger Apoſtle James, the ſon of Alphæus, it is canonical. But if it was written by the James, who was brother in law of Chriſt, and not an Apoſtle, we can have no proof of its inſpiration and infallibility. Supernatural aſſiſtance was promiſed by Chriſt to the Apoſtles alone: and therefore, though James, the brother in law of Chriſt, was a man of great eminence in the church of Jeruſalem, though he took a principal part in the firſt council, which was held there, though he is called by St. Paul a pillar of the church, and is mentioned Gal. ii. 9. even before St. Peter and St. John, yet all theſe circumſtances put together are not ſufficient to prove that his writings were divinely inſpired. I conclude therefore by repeating the aſſertion that, if the James, who wrote this Epiſtle, was either the one or the other of the twelve Apoſtles, who bore this name, it is canonical; but if not, it is not canonical.

CHAP. XXVII.

OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

SECT. I.

Of the persons to whom St. Peter addressed this Epistle.

ST. PETER begins his first Epistle with the following address: Πετρος αποστολος Ιησυ Χριστυ εκλεκτοις παρεπιδημοις διασπορας Ποντυ, Γαλατιας, Καππαδοκιας, Ασιας, και Βιθυνιας. These εκλεκτοι παρεπιδημοι διασπορας are supposed by many commentators to have been native Jews dispersed in these countries, who had been coverted to Christianity. But I am of opinion that they were not native Jews, and for the following reasons.

1. St. Peter says, ch. i. 18. 'Ye know, ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers.' Now 'vain conversation,' according to the biblical sense of the word 'vain,' denotes 'idolatrous conversation[s].' Consequently the persons, to whom St. Peter wrote, were formerly idolaters, and therefore not native Jews.

2. St. Peter says in express terms, ch. iv. 3. that these very persons had spent the former part of their lives in 'abominable idolatries.' Here therefore he certainly meant heathen converts, for in the Apostolic age idolatry was a vice, to which the Jews were not addicted. To evade this argument, the advocates for the opinion, that St. Peter wrote to native Jews, assert that the word idolatry is here used not literally, as denoting the worship of idols, but figuratively, and that idolatry is equivalent to

[s] See 1 Kings xvi. 2. 13. 26. 2 Kings xvii. 15. Isaiah x. 20. Jerem. ii. 5. viii. 19. x. 3. 8. Jonah ii. 9. Rom. i. 21.

to avarice, becauſe a miſer worſhips his gold; or to fornication, becauſe this was not uncommon in the heathen temples. Now I do not deny, that idolatry is ſometimes uſed in a figurative ſenſe, but I cannot admit, that it is uſed ſo in the preſent inſtance. For St. Peter in this very place enumerates ſeveral other vices, all of which muſt be taken in their ſtrict and literal ſenſe: and therefore no reaſon can be aſſigned, why an exception ſhould be made to the word 'idolatry' in particular. Beſides, if we refuſe to aſcribe to it its literal meaning, it is impoſſible to determine what its meaning really is.

There are ſeveral other paſſages in this Epiſtle, which tend to confirm my opinion, though I do not conſider them alone as deciſive. For inſtance, ch. i. 14. St. Peter ſays: 'as obedient children, not faſhioning yourſelves according to the former luſts *in your ignorance.*' Now an ignorance of the word of God cannot eaſily be imputed to the Jews, who had received the oracles of God. Again he ſays, ch. v. 12. 'I have written briefly, exhorting and teſtifying, that this is the grace of God, wherein ye ſtand.' Here St. Peter explains the object, which he had in view, in writing this Epiſtle: but if he had written to native Jews, this would hardly have been his object, becauſe the Jews were already the favourite people of God, and therefore St. Peter would not have thought it neceſſary to prove, that they ſtood in his grace.

Having produced the arguments, which induce me to believe, that St. Peter did not write to native Jews, I will now examine the arguments, which have been alleged in favour of the contrary opinion.

1. St. Peter exhorts his readers to holineſs, ch. i. 15, 16. and quotes from Lev. xi. 44. the words 'Be ye holy, for I am holy.' Now theſe words were addreſſed to the Iſraelites: and hence it is inferred, that St. Peter likewiſe addreſſed Iſraelites in this Epiſtle. But this inference is without foundation: for an Apoſtle, let his readers be of what deſcription they will, may

on

on certain occaſions apply to them words, which had formerly been uſed to the Iſraelites. And in the preſent inſtance, ſince by the Chriſtian diſpenſation the heathens became entitled to divine favour, as well as the Jews, St. Peter could with the utmoſt propriety apply to the former what originally had been ſaid only to the latter.

2. Another argument is grounded on ch. ii. 9. where St. Peter ſays, 'Ye are a choſen generation, a royal prieſthood,' which words are likewiſe applied in the Old Teſtament particularly to the Jewiſh nation. Hence the ſame inference has been deduced, as from ch. i. 15, 16.: but the anſwer, which I have given to the one, is at the ſame time an anſwer to the other argument. Through the death of Chriſt the heathens acquired the ſame privileges, as the Jews had till then enjoyed alone: and if St. Peter had ſaid to Chriſtians, who had been converted from Judaiſm, that they were a choſen generation, he would have ſaid it, not in reſpect to their origin, but in reſpect to their redemption by Chriſt. He might very properly ſay therefore to heathen converts, 'Ye are a choſen generation, a royal prieſthood,' ſince they were become the people of God as well as the Jews: but it would have been unneceſſary to have made this declaration to thoſe, who were native Jews, becauſe they entertained no doubt, that they were the choſen people of God.

3. St. Peter in ch. ii. 12. exhorts his readers to walk honeſtly 'among the Gentiles.' Hence it is inferred, that they themſelves were not Gentiles. This I readily grant, ſince St. Peter wrote to Chriſtians: but we muſt not therefore conclude, that they were not Gentiles before their converſion.

4. St. Peter addreſſing the Chriſtian women, ch. iii. 6. calls them 'daughters of Sara:' from which expreſſion has been deduced the inference, that they were the natural deſcendants of Sara, and therefore native Jews. But this argument is confuted by the very paſſage, to which appeal is made: for St. Peter qua-

lifies

lifies this appellation by adding 'as long as ye do well.' It is evident therefore, that he speaks figuratively, and that he meant to say, 'As long as ye practise the virtues of Sara, ye deserve to be called her daughters:' for the conditional clause wholly excludes the notion of descent by blood. The expression 'sons of Abraham' occurs frequently in the New Testament in a figurative sense: and though this is the only place, where the expression 'daughters of Sara' is used in a similar manner, yet the passage is so clear, that it admits of no doubt. For as Abraham is called the father of the faithful, so Sara may be called the mother of the faithful: and this very epithet was given to one of Mohammed's wives.

It appears then, that the arguments advanced by those, who contend, that St. Peter wrote to native Jews, are by no means satisfactory. And the answers, which have been given them, serve at the same time to invalidate a similar opinion, that St. Peter wrote to Christian converts from the ten tribes, who had been carried captive into Assyria: for in the time of St. Peter the Israelites of the ten tribes were no more idolaters, than those of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. There is likewise another objection, to which this opinion is exposed, namely, that the ten tribes, when this Epistle was written, did not constitute a separate people, but were intermixed with those, which returned to Palestine from the Babylonish captivity [h]. And if this be denied, and it be asserted, that the ten tribes did not return from the Assyrian captivity, we cannot suppose, that they resided, when this Epistle was written, in Cappadocia, Galatia, Bithynia, and in the proconsular province of Asia, in the neighbourhood of Ephesus. It is true, that St. Peter in ch. ii. 10. addresses the persons, to whom he writes, in the same words, which Hosea had used to the ten tribes. But this is no proof, that both writers

[h] See my treatise De exsilio decem tribuum, Sect. 6—10, printed in the Commentationes societati scientiarum Goettingensi per annos 1758—1762, oblatæ.

writers addreſſed themſelves to the ſame nation: for, St. Peter, in addreſſing heathen converts, might ſay of them, 'that they were formerly not the people of God, but were now become his people,' with as much truth as Hoſea ſaid this of the ten tribes. Beſides, this very paſſage is likewiſe quoted by St. Paul in Rom. ix. 25.: and therefore if the argument proved any thing, it would prove likewiſe, what no one can admit, that the Epiſtle to the Romans was written to converts from the ten tribes.

Another opinion relative to the perſons to whom St. Peter wrote, is, that they were neither native Jews alone, nor native heathens alone, but that they conſiſted of men of both deſcriptions. This opinion however is confuted by the very firſt verſe of this Epiſtle, in which St. Peter calls the perſons, whom he addreſſes, by the title of παρεπιδημοι διασπορας Ποντε, κ. τ. λ. For the word διασπορα in Jewiſh Greek, when followed by the name of a heathen country or people, in the genitive caſe, denotes the Jews, who were diſperſed there. For inſtance, διασπορα Ἑλληνων, John vii. 35. ſignifies, at leaſt, as I underſtand the paſſage, the Jews, who were diſperſed among the Greeks: and Wetſtein in his note to this verſe, quotes the following paſſage from an apocryphal Greek fragment of Jeremiah, γραψον αυ εν τη επιςολη προς Ιερεμιαν, ὁτι ειπατε τοις υἱοις Ισραηλ —ὁ δε Βαρυχ απεςειλεν εις την διασποραν των εθνων, where διασπορα των εθνων can have no other meaning than 'the Jews diſperſed among the Gentiles.' Other examples, where διασπορα, without a genitive expreſſive of a heathen country, is uſed to denote diſperſed Jews, may be ſeen in Deut. xxviii. 25. xxx. 4. Iſaiah xlix. 6. Pſalm cxlvii. 2. Nehem. i. 9. Judith v. 19. 2 Maccab. i. 27. James i. 1. Hence therefore we may infer, that St. Peter meant by παρεπιδημοι διασπορας Ποντε, Γαλατιας, κ. τ. λ. the Jews, who were diſperſed in Pontus, Galatia[1], &c.

[1] The word παρεπιδημοι likewiſe is an appellation more ſuitable to the Jews, who were diſperſed in Pontus, Galatia, &c. than to the heathen inhabitants of theſe countries.

&c. It will be thought perhaps, that this inference contradicts what I endeavoured to prove in the former part of this ſection, namely, that St. Peter did not addreſs his Epiſtle to native Jews. But the contradiction is only apparent: for the perſons, to whom St. Peter wrote, might have been Jews by profeſſion, though not Jews by birth, or in other words, they might have been native heathens, who were proſelytes to Judaiſm, before their converſion to Chriſtianity.

This laſt opinion is, that of Dr. Benſon, and which, though it has met with ſome oppoſition, I ſtill think the moſt probable. The expreſſion 'ſtrangers ſcattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, &c.' may very properly denote Jewiſh proſelytes, who had embraced the Chriſtian religion, or perſons, who were born heathens, but were become converts, firſt to Judaiſm, and then to Chriſtianity. Now the Jews had two kinds of proſelytes, which they called 'proſelytes of juſtice,' and 'proſelytes of the gate.' The former were circumciſed, and became in every reſpect Jews: the latter were not circumciſed, but they believed in the Jewiſh religion, and worſhipped the one true God. Cornelius, the firſt native heathen, converted by St. Peter to Chriſtianity, was a proſelyte of this deſcription: and the perſons, to whom he wrote this Epiſtle were probably proſelytes of the ſame kind, for the proſelytes of juſtice were ſo completely Jews, that the contents of the Epiſtle do not ſo well apply to them, as to the proſelytes of the gate.

The word παρεπιδήμοι, which ſignifies literally 'ſtrangers,' is uſed by St. Peter to denote 'proſelytes,' in imitation of the rabbinical writers, who called the proſelytes to their religion by the name of גרים, or ſtrangers. It will be objected perhaps, that the proſelytes to the Jewiſh religion are in no other part of the New Teſtament called by this name; that the proper Greek term for them is προσήλυτοι[k], and that where this appellation

[k] Matth. xxiii. 15. Acts ii. 10. vi. 5. xiii. 43.

pellation is not uſed, they are called either: ευλαβεις[l], or ευσεβεις[m], or σεβομενοι τον θεον[n], or φοβουμενοι τον θεον[o]. And hence it will be inferred, that, if St. Peter really addreſſed his Epiſtle to Jewiſh proſelytes, he would either have uſed the proper term προσηλυτοι, or ſome word, by which they are denoted in other parts of the New Teſtament. Now I admit, that this is a very plauſible argument: but the queſtion is; does not παρεπιδημοι, admit of this ſenſe, when uſed by a Jewiſh Greek writer, ſince the correſpondent Hebrew term גרים is the common appellation of proſelytes, both in the Talmud, and in the works of the Rabbins? And, if it does admit of this ſenſe, no one can prove, that it was not thus uſed by St. Peter. That in other parts of the New Teſtament, proſelytes are not denoted by a term, which is literally expreſſive of ſtrangers, is the leſs extraordinary, when we conſider, that the whole New Teſtament is a book of no great magnitude. I believe however, that there really is one other inſtance of this kind in Acts ii. 10. where the Romans, who were preſent at Jeruſalem, and who, according to ver. 5. were proſelytes, are called οι επιδημουντες Ρωμαιοι.

If the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter was written to Jewiſh proſelytes, the reaſon is obvious, why the Apoſtle ſo frequently alludes both to Jewiſh cuſtoms, and to paſſages of the Old Teſtament. The ſuppoſition agrees likewiſe with the purport of the Epiſtle, which St. Peter explains, ch. v. 12. ſaying, 'I have written briefly, exhorting, and teſtifying, that this is the true grace of God, wherein ye ſtand.' For perſons, who were proſelytes to Judaiſm before their converſion to Chriſtianity, were more in need of exhortations, and aſſurances of the grace of God, in which they ſtood, than even heathen converts, becauſe the latter were leſs

[l] Acts ii. 5. [m] Acts x. 2. 7.

[n] Acts xiii. 50. xvi. 14. xvii. 4. 17. xviii. 7.

[o] Acts x. 2. 22. 35. xiii. 16. 26.

leſs expoſed to the importunities of the Jewiſh zealots, who maintained, that no man could be ſaved without the obſervance of the Levitical law. Now theſe exhortations and aſſurances could come from no one with greater propriety than from St. Peter, who was the firſt, that made a Chriſtian convert of an uncircumciſed Jewiſh proſelyte [p], and at the Apoſtolic council in Jeruſalem, where he defended the rights of the heathens, had alleged this converſion as a proof, that the uncircumciſed, as well as the circumciſed, were entitled to divine favour [q].

The motive, which induced St. Peter to write to Jewiſh proſelytes, then become converts to Chriſtianity, in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Aſia, and Bithynia, it is difficult at preſent to aſſign, becauſe we have not ſufficient hiſtorical data. Perhaps Sylvanus, who carried this Epiſtle, had occaſion to travel through theſe countries, and St. Peter embraced this opportunity of writing to the Chriſtians, who reſided in thoſe places, through which Silvanus's route would lead him. If this ſuppoſition be true, the reaſon is obvious, why St. Peter firſt mentions Pontus. For this was the firſt Grecian colony, in which Sylvanus arrived, after he had left St. Peter in Babylon; for in Meſopotamia, through which he had to travel in his way to Pontus, Syriac was the common language, and therefore a Greek Epiſtle would have been of no uſe to the Meſopotamian Chriſtians.

[p] Cornelius, Acts x. [q] Acts xv. 7, 8, 9.

SECT. II.

Before St. Peter wrote this Epistle, he appears to have read St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

A COMPARISON of 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14. with Rom. xiii. 1—5. will shew, either that St. Peter had read St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, or St. Paul the first Epistle of St. Peter.

St. Paul says, Rom. xiii. 1. πασα ψυχη εξουσιαις υπερεχουσαις υποτασσεσθω. The expression εξουσιαις υπερεχουσαις is in general falsely understood, being usually translated 'higher powers,' as if inferior powers, or inferior magistrates had not likewise a right to command obedience. But this was certainly not St. Paul's meaning; and I have no doubt, that he used υπερεχω in the sense of 'protego[r],' and that he intended to express, 'Let every man be obedient to the power, which protects him.' Now this is a rule, which is founded on equity, and is universally applicable, whether that power had been acquired justly or unjustly. Obedience and protection are reciprocal: and as long as we enjoy the latter, we are bound to perform the former. Even in the case of conquest, the conqueror, as long as he protects us, has a right to command our obedience: and we must either quit the country, or submit to his laws. The same equitable rule, though not usually found in systems of morality, is given by St. Peter, ch. ii. 13. υποταγητε —— βασιλει, ως υπερεχοντι. Further, St. Paul says, Rom. xiii. 3. where he speaks of the authority of magistrates, το αγαθον ποιει, και εξεις επαινον εξ αυτης: and in

[r] When υπερεχω signifies 'protego,' some such word as δεξιαν or σκεπην is understood. The former is supplied by Josephus, Antiquit. VI. 2. 2. παρακαλει τον θεον, υπερεχειν αυτων την δεξιαν εν τη προς Παλαιστινους μαχη.

in like manner St. Peter, ch. ii. 14. deſcribes magiſtrates as being conſtituted, εις επαινον αγαθοποιων. This is likewiſe an agreement in an aſſertion, which, though perfectly true, is not common: for magiſtrates do not uſually beſtow commendations, but ſimply acquit or condemn, and the greateſt praiſe, which a man can have in this reſpect is, never to have appeared before them. Laſtly, St. Paul, Rom. xiii. 4. deſcribes a magiſtrate as being εκδικος εις οργην τω το κακον πρασσοντι: St. Peter, ch. ii. 14. ſays of the ſame, that he is appointed εις εκδικησιν κακοποιων [s].

This remarkable agreement, in the compaſs of two verſes, affords ſufficient proof, that either St. Peter had read St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Romans, or St. Paul the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter. But the latter is not probable, becauſe St. Paul's writings ſo abound with original thoughts, that he hardly derived any of his materials from St. Peter. I conclude therefore, that the former is true: and this concluſion is confirmed by what St. Peter ſays in his ſecond Epiſtle, ch. iii. 15, 16. where he ſpeaks of the contents of St. Paul's Epiſtles in general. Further, St. Peter's ſtyle, though it has many peculiarities, comes nearer to the ſtyle of St. Paul, than that of any other writer of the New Teſtament. Now no one can ſuppoſe, that the writings of

[s] There are other inſtances of agreement between the Epiſtle to the Romans and the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter, though they are not ſo deciſive as the preceding. St. Peter, ch. i. 21. ſpeaks of faith, as being 'a belief, that God raiſed Chriſt from the dead:' and the ſame explanation is given by St. Paul, Rom. iv. 24. x. 9. St. Paul deſcribes at large, Rom. vi. the nature and effects of baptiſm, and ſhews, that we obtain by it a participation of the benefits of Chriſt's reſurrection: and St. Peter alſo ſays, though in more conciſe terms, ch. iii. 20. that baptiſm ſaves us through the reſurrection of Chriſt. What St. Peter ſays, ch. iv. 10, 11. is the ſame as what St. Paul ſays more fully, Rom. xii. 3—8. The following paſſages may likewiſe be compared, 1 Pet. i. 2. 14. 22. with Rom. i. 5. vi. 16.—1 Pet. i. 7. with Rom. ii. 6.—1 Pet. i. 14. with Rom. xii. 2.—1 Pet. i. 18. with Rom. i. 11.—and 1 Pet. ii. 2. λογικον with Rom. xii. 1.

of St. Peter had any influence on the Greek style of a man, who was born at Tarsus: but the reverse of this supposition is not at all improbable.

SECT. III.

Of the time, when this Epistle was written.

IF St. Peter, as I have endeavoured to shew in the preceding section, had read St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans before he wrote his first Epistle, it was written after St. Paul's journey from Corinth to Jerusalem, described in Acts xx. xxi. for the Epistle to the Romans was written from Corinth. How much later than the time of this journey the first Epistle of St. Peter was written, it is very difficult, for want of sufficient data, to determine. The Epistle itself has hardly any marks, which can guide us in deciding the year of its composition; and we know nothing of the history of St. Peter from the time of the Apostolic council in Jerusalem, Acts xv. which is the last place, where St. Luke mentions him, till his arrival many years afterwards in Rome, where, according to the accounts of ecclesiastical writers, he suffered martyrdom. However, a comparison of the first with the second Epistle of St. Peter will enable us to form at least an opinion on this subject. St. Peter says in his second Epistle, ch. iii. 1. ταυτην ηδη, αγαπητοι, δευτεραν υμιν γραφω επιστολην; whence we may conclude, that his first Epistle was written to the same persons as the second. But if the second Epistle was written fifteen or twenty years after the first, they, who received the one, were not the same persons, as they, who received the other; and we might rather expect, that in this case St. Peter would have called

his first Epistle, an Epistle, which he had written to their fathers. It appears then, that the interval between the dates of the two Epistles could not have been very great; and, as the second Epistle was written shortly before St. Peter's death[t], we may infer, that the first Epistle was written, either not long before, or not long after, the year 60.

I was formerly of opinion, that this Epistle was written much earlier; but as I now perceive, that the arguments, on which I grounded it, are erroneous, I think it my duty to point out their weakness, lest others should fall into the same mistake. I supposed, that this Epistle was written about the time of the Apostolic council in Jerusalem, mentioned in Acts xv. for the two following reasons: first, because both this Epistle was written, and that council was held with the same view, namely, to calm the uneasiness of the uncircumcised: and secondly, because Silas, who was one of the persons, which carried to Antioch the decree of the Apostolic council[u], is supposed to be the same as Silvanus, who carried the first Epistle of St. Peter[w] to the Christians in Pontus, Cappadocia, &c. But these reasons are unsatisfactory. For St. Peter dates his Epistle from Babylon[x], and therefore we cannot suppose, that it was written at Jerusalem, without ascribing to the word Babylon a mystical sense, of which it is hardly capable. Besides, even if it be granted, that Silas and Silvanus are one and the same person, yet Silas could not have taken with him St. Peter's first Epistle at the time, when he carried from Jerusalem the decree of the Apostolic council. For when he carried St. Peter's first Epistle, his route was through Pontus, Cappadocia, Galatia, Asia, and Bithynia: but when Silas went from Jerusalem with the decree of the Apostolic council, he went first to Antioch, where he staid some time, and then

[t] See 2 Pet. i. 13, 14, 15.
[u] Acts xv. 23. 27. 32.
[w] 1 Pet. v. 12.
[x] 1 Pet. v. 13.

then travelled through Syria and Cilicia[y]. Nor does he appear, when he left Jerusalem, to have had any intention of going further than Antioch[z]: consequently, he could not have been intrusted with an Epistle from St. Peter to the inhabitants of Pontus and Cappadocia.

On the other hand, Lardner[a] assigns to this Epistle too late a date, for he is of opinion, that it was written between 63 and 65. His reason for supposing, that it was not written till after 63, is, that an earlier date cannot be assigned for St. Peter's arrival in Rome. And, as he takes the word Babylon, whence St. Peter dates his Epistle, not in its proper, but in a mystical sense, as denoting Rome, he concludes, that the Epistle was not written before the time above-mentioned. But if we take Babylon in its proper sense, the argument not only proves not what Lardner intended, but proves the very reverse. For, if St. Peter's arrival in Rome is to be dated about the year 63, an Epistle, written by St. Peter in Babylon must have a date prior to that year.

[y] Acts xv. 30. 34. 40, 41.

[z] This will be evident to every one, who reads the whole passage, Acts xiv. 26—xv. 41.

[a] Supplement, Vol. III. Ch. 19. Sect. 4.

SECT. IV.

Babylon, the place whence St. Peter dates his firſt Epiſtle, is either the ancient Babylon on the Euphrates, or Seleucia on the Tigris: but more probably the former.

ST. PETER at the cloſe of his Epiſtle ſends a ſalutation from the church in Babylon[b], which conſequently is the place, where he wrote his Epiſtle. But commentators do not agree in regard to the meaning of the word Babylon, ſome taking it in its literal and proper ſenſe, others giving it a figurative and myſtical interpretation. Among the advocates for the latter ſenſe have been men of ſuch learning and abilities, that I was miſled by their authority in the younger part of my life to ſubſcribe to it: but at preſent, as I have more impartially examined the queſtion, it appears to me very extraordinary, that when an Apoſtle dates his Epiſtle from Babylon, it ſhould ever occur to any commentator to aſcribe to this word a myſtical meaning, inſtead of taking it in its literal and proper ſenſe. For in the firſt century the ancient Babylon on the Euphrates was ſtill in exiſtence[c]: and there was likewiſe a city on the Tigris, Seleucia, not far diſtant from the ancient Babylon, to which the name of modern Babylon was given. But through ſome miſtake it has been ſuppoſed,

[b] Ασπαζεται ὑμας ἡ ἐν Βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη. With συνεκλεκτη we muſt underſtand ἐκκλησια, and not γυνη, as ſome commentators have done.

[c] The Syrian writers, of the ſect of the Neſtorians, according to Aſſemani Bibl. Orient. Tom. III. P. ii. p. 6. underſtand for the moſt part the ancient Babylon, though Aſſeman himſelf, out of partiality to the church of Rome, underſtands it myſtically. He quotes however, as advocates of a literal interpretation, the reſpectable names of Eraſmus, Druſius, J. Capellus, Lightfoot, Baſnage, to whom may be added Beauſobre, who has moſt ably defended the literal interpretation in his Hiſtoire des Manichéens, Tom. I. Liv. ii. Ch. 3. § 1. p. 181, 182.

posed, that the ancient Babylon, in the time of St. Peter, was no longer in being: and, in order to furnish a pretence for a mystical interpretation, it has been denied, that Seleucia was ever so called.

It is true, that the ancient Babylon, in comparison of its original splendor, might be called in the first century a desolated city; yet it was not wholly a heap of ruins, nor wholly destitute of inhabitants. This appears from the account, which Strabo, who lived in the time of Tiberius, has given of it: for he says [d], that Alexander (who died at Babylon, and who intended, if he had lived, to have made it the place of his residence) proposed to rebuild there a large pyramid, which was a stadium in length, in breadth, and in heighth, but that his successors did not put the design in execution: that the Persians destroyed a part of Babylon [e], and that the Macedonians neglected it: but that Babylon had suffered the most from the building of Seleucia by Seleucus Nicator, at the distance of three hundred stadia from it, because Seleucia then became the capital of the country, and Babylon was drained of its inhabitants. Strabo then adds, 'At present Seleucia is greater than Babylon, which last city has been desolated, so that one may say of it, what the comic poet said of Megalopolis in Arcadia, "A great city is become a great desert [f]." If this is not sufficient proof, that Babylon was still in existence in the first century, the reader may consult Cellarii Geographia, T. II. p. 747. and Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, T. III. P. ii. p. 7.

It will be objected perhaps, that if Babylon still existed in the time of St. Peter, it was yet in such a state of decay, that an Apostle would hardly have gone to preach the Gospel there. But I can see no reason why he should not, especially as Babylon was at that time

[d] Pag. 738 or 1073.

[e] Namely they pulled down a part of the wall.

[f] Ἔρημια μεγαλη ἐστιν ἡ μεγαλη πολις.

time ſo far from being literally deſtitute of inhabitants, that Strabo draws a parallel between this city and Seleucia, ſaying, 'at preſent Babylon is not ſo great as Seleucia,' which was then the capital of the Parthian empire, and, according to Pliny, contained ſix hundred thouſand inhabitants. To conclude therefore, that Babylon, whence St. Peter dates his Epiſtle, could not have been the ancient Babylon, becauſe this city was then in a ſtate of decay, and thence to argue, that St. Peter uſed the word myſtically to denote Rome, is nearly the ſame, as if on the receipt of a letter dated from Ghent or Antwerp, in which mention was made of a Chriſtian community there, I concluded, that becauſe theſe cities are no longer what they were in the ſixteenth century, the writer of the Epiſtle meant a ſpiritual Ghent or Antwerp, and that the Epiſtle was really written from Amſterdam.

It is therefore at leaſt poſſible, that St. Peter wrote his firſt Epiſtle in the ancient Babylon on the Euphrates. But before we conclude, that he really did write there, we muſt firſt examine, whether he did not mean Seleucia on the Tigris, which was ſometimes called the modern Babylon. According to Strabo, Seleucia was only three hundred ſtadia diſtant from the ancient Babylon: and it was ſeparated by the Tigris from Cteſiphon, the winter reſidence of the Parthian kings. At preſent it is not called Bagdad, as ſome have ſuppoſed, which is a very different city: but, in conjunction with Cteſiphon, is named by Syrian and Arabic writers, Medinotho, Medain, Modain[g], under which name it appears in D'Anville's maps, in the latitude of 33°. 7½'.

That Seleucia on the Tigris was called Babylon may be proved by ſeveral authorities. Stephanus Byzantinus, de

[g] The beſt accounts of Modain are to be found, not in Cellarius, but in Aſſemani Bibl. Orient. T. III. P. ii. p. 622—626. and in the two alphabetical indexes to the biſhops' ſees, in the ſecond volume, and the ſecond part of the third volume.

de Urbibus[h], p. 149. under the article Βαβυλων, says, Βαβυλων, περσικη πολις, Μητροπολις, Σελευκεια καλεμενη[i]. Sidonius Apollinaris, in his ninth poem, ver. 19, 20, 21, says,

> Non coctam Babylona personabo,
> Quæ largum, fluvio patens alumno,
> Inclusum bibit hinc et inde Tigrim.

This is evidently a description of Seleucia on the one side, and of Ctesiphon on the other side of the Tigris, both which cities Sidonius includes under the name of Babylon: and the mention of the Tigris clearly shews, that he meant not the ancient Babylon on the Euphrates[k]. To these two authorities may be added, that

[h] I here quote the Amsterdam edition of 1678.

[i] Mosheim, who ascribes a mystical meaning to the word Babylon in the first Epistle of St. Peter, has endeavoured to destroy the force of this testimony of Stephanus Byzantinus by inverting its meaning. He supposes namely, not that the name of Babylon was given to Seleucia, but that the name of Seleucia was applied by mistake to the ancient Babylon. Now the passage certainly admits not of this interpretation, and the word μητροπολις clearly shews, that Stephanus did not mean the ancient Babylon on the Euphrates, which in his time was in a state of desolation.

[k] Mosheim argues from the epithet 'cocta,' that Sidonius meant the ancient Babylon, the walls of which were built, not of stone, but of brick. But this epithet may apply to Seleucia, as well as to the ancient Babylon, for according to Niebuhr, there are no stone quarries in the whole country round about Seleucia, and therefore the cities on the Tigris are in general built of brick. But even if Seleucia had been built of stone, the epithet 'cocta' cannot prove, that Sidonius meant a city on the Euphrates, when he expressly speaks of a city on the Tigris. It would shew nothing more, than that he was mistaken in respect to the materials of which that city was built; and that he falsely applied to the modern Babylon an epithet, which he had heard applied to the ancient Babylon, thus confounding the two cities, in the same manner as several modern geographers have confounded Babylon and Bagdad.

that of Lucan, a contemporary of St. Peter, who ſays, at the beginning of his Pharſalia,

> Cumque ſuperba foret Babylon ſpolianda trophæis
> Auſoniis, umbraque erraret Craſſus inulta.

Here Lucan undoubtedly meant Seleucia on the Tigris, where the Parthian general Surena had held his triumph over Craſſus: and it is ſelf-evident, that the Roman eagles and trophies were hung up by the Parthians either at Seleucia or Cteſiphon, not in the ancient and forſaken Babylon, which the Parthians totally neglected. Laſtly, in the Septuagint verſion, the Hebrew word, כלנה, which denotes Cteſiphon, is rendered Χαλανη, Iſaiah x. 9. with the following addition, not found in the Hebrew, ὡς ὁ πυργος ᾠκοδομηθη. Now this interpolation, though probably not made by the Greek tranſlator himſelf, ſhews at leaſt, that in the time of the interpolator the ancient Babylon began already to be confounded with Cteſiphon and Seleucia.

Since then the name of Babylon was actually given to Seleucia, it is not impoſſible, that St. Peter thus underſtood the word Babylon, and that his firſt Epiſtle therefore was written at Seleucia on the Tigris. But I have ſhewn in the preceding part of this ſection, that there is likewiſe a poſſibility of its having been written in Babylon, properly ſo called, or in the ancient Babylon on the Euphrates. The queſtion therefore is, which of theſe two ſenſes ſhall we aſcribe to the word Babylon? for one of theſe two we muſt aſcribe to it, unleſs we give it, without any reaſon, a myſtical interpretation. In the two laſt editions of this Introduction, I preferred the former ſenſe: but after a more mature conſideration I think it much more probable at preſent, that St. Peter meant the ancient Babylon. It is true, that Lucan, Sidonius Apollinaris, and Stephanus Byzantinus gave the name of Babylon to Seleucia. But the two laſt of theſe writers lived ſo late as the fifth century,

and

and therefore their authority is perhaps not sufficient to prove, that Seleucia was called Babylon in the first century. Lucan indeed was a contemporary of St. Peter: but then he uses this word in an epic poem, in which a writer is not bound by the same rules, as in prose: and it is not improbable, that he selected the word Babylon, partly because its celebrity added to the pomp of his diction, and partly because neither Ctesiphon nor Seleucia would have suited the verse. The writer of an Epistle, on the contrary, can allow himself no such latitude, and perspicuity requires, that in the date of his Epistle, he should use no other name for the town, where he writes, than that which properly belongs to it. If therefore St. Peter had really written at Seleucia, he would hardly have called this city by the name of Babylon, though this name was sometimes applied to it. Consequently, it is most probable, that St. Peter wrote his first Epistle in the ancient Babylon on the Euphrates [1].

Before I conclude this section I must take notice of a passage in Josephus, which not only confutes all notions of a spiritual or mystical Babylon, but throws a great light on the whole of our present inquiry. And this passage is of so much the more importance, because Josephus was an historian, who lived in the same age with St. Peter, and the passage itself relates to an event, which took place thirty-six years before the Christian era, namely, the delivery of Hyrcanus, the Jewish high priest, from imprisonment, by order of Phraates, king of Parthia, with permission to reside in Babylon, where there was a considerable number of Jews. This is recorded by Josephus, Antiquit. XV. 2. 2. in the following

[1] On the supposition, that the ancient Babylon did not exist when St. Peter wrote, it has been conjectured, that he meant, not the city, but the province of Babylon. But since the supposition is ungrounded, there is no necessity for having recourse to this conjecture, which is very improbable, because, if St. Peter had meant the province, and not the city, he would not have written ἐν Βαβυλῶνι, but ἐν Βαβυλωνίᾳ.

following words, Δια τουτο δεσμων μεν αφηκεν, εν Βαβυλωνι δε καταγεσθαι παρειχεν, ενθα και πληθος ην Ιουδαιων. Josephus then adds, that both the Jews in Babylon, and all, who dwelt in that country as far as the Euphrates [m], respected Hyrcanus, as high priest, and king. Now the word Babylon in this passage of Josephus, evidently means a city in the east, and it cannot possibly be interpreted in a mystical manner either of Jerusalem or of Rome, The only question is, whether he meant the ancient Babylon on the Euphrates, or Seleucia on the Tigris, The former is the most obvious interpretation, and it is warranted by the circumstance, that in other places, where Josephus speaks of Seleucia on the Tigris, he calls it by its real and proper name, Seleucia [n].

SECT. V.

Confutation of the arguments alleged in favour of a mystical interpretation of the word Babylon.

THE first argument in favour of a mystical, and against a literal, interpretation of the word Babylon, is, that in the whole country of Babylonia there were no Jews in the time of St. Peter [o]: and thence it is inferred, that he could not have gone to preach the Gospel there. Now in this argument both the premises and the inference are false. The inference is false,

[m] Μεχρις Ευφρατου. This expression does not imply, that the Babylon, of which Josephus speaks, did not lie on the Euphrates. He writes here, in reference rather to the situation of the Parthian empire, than to the situation of Judæa.

[n] For instance, Antiquit. Lib. XVIII. C. 2. § 4. C. 9. § 8, 9.

[o] This is asserted by Pearson in his Opera posthuma.

falſe, becauſe, even if there had been no Jews in the whole country of Babylonia, St. Peter might have gone to preach the Goſpel there: for he preached to the uncircumciſed at Cæſarea[p], and he himſelf declared, that it was ordained by God, 'that the Gentiles by his mouth ſhould hear the word of the Goſpel, and believe[q].' The premiſes themſelves likewiſe are totally ungrounded: for, if we except Paleſtine, there was no country in the world, where the Jews were ſo numerous and ſo powerful, as in the province of Babylonia, in which they had their two celebrated ſeats of learning, Nehardea and Sura.

It is true, that Joſephus mentions a cruel maſſacre of the Jews in Seleucia, which happened about forty years after the birth of Chriſt: but whoever attentively reads the whole relation of Joſephus muſt perceive, that this maſſacre by no means extirpated the Jews of that country, and that the effect, which it had in the province of Babylonia, was rather an augmentation than a diminution of their number. This relation is given in the laſt chapter of the eighteenth book of his Antiquities: and the following is an extract from it.

It was the cuſtom of the Jews, who lived in the eaſt, to depoſit their half ſhekel, and other offerings deſtined for the temple, in the fortified cities of Niſibis, and Nehardea, whence they were annually tranſported to Jeruſalem, under a ſafe convoy, on account of the bands of robbers, which infeſted the country. In the latter of theſe two cities, which, from its ſituation on the Euphrates, was almoſt impregnable, Aſinæus and Anilæus, two Jews, who were brothers, and had been ill treated by their heathen maſters, put themſelves at the head of a gang of robbers, and by degrees made themſelves maſters of the place. In this ſituation they continued, ſubject indeed to the kings of Parthia, but very troubleſome to their neighbours: till at laſt they were defeated in a war, which they had undertaken againſt the Parthian governor of an ancient diſtrict. From

[p] Acts x. [q] Acts xv. 7.

From this time Anilæus had again recourſe to robbery, and infeſted with his depredations the province of Babylonia. Upon this, the Babylonians demanded of the Jews in Nehardea, that Anilæus ſhould be delivered up to them: which the Nehardeans refuſing, the Babylonians attacked Anilæus in his camp[r], defeated and killed him. The Jews being now the weaker party were expoſed to numerous inconveniences: and accordingly they, who lived in the neighbourhood of Nehardea[s], retired to Seleucia, where they remained five years in ſecurity. Their numbers being now very conſiderable in Seleucia, they began to be very troubleſome: and having interfered in a diſpute between the Syrian and Greek inhabitants of the place, they were attacked by both parties, and a maſſacre enſued, in which fifty thouſand Jews loſt their lives. This maſſacre, according to the relation of Joſephus, muſt have happened a ſhort time before the death of Caligula, that is, about the year 40 of the Chriſtian era, and not long before the events recorded in the twelfth chapter of the Acts of the Apoſtles. They, who eſcaped, retreated to Cteſiphon, which was ſeparated from Seleucia by the Tigris; but not finding themſelves ſafe even here, they fled, though it is uncertain in what year, to Niſibis and Nehardea, where the ſtrength of theſe cities, and the bravery of the inhabitants, afforded them that protection, which they could not obtain elſewhere. Hence it appears, that Nehardea conſtantly remained in the poſſeſſion of the Jews: and, as only a part of theſe had retired out of Babylonia to Seleucia, on the death of Anilæus, ſo it is probable, that after the

[r] It muſt be particularly noted, that this happened in the camp of Anilæus, not in the town of Nehardea.

[s] The Jews, who lived in the town, did not leave it, for it appears from the ſequel, that Nehardea ſtill remained in their poſſeſſion. Nor did all the Jews, who lived in the neighbouring diſtrict, go away: for Joſephus relates, that between five and ſix years afterwards another colony of Jews retreated out of Babylonia to Seleucia on account of the plague.

the massacre in Seleucia, such of them, as were on good terms with the heathen inhabitants, did not return again to Babylonia. At any rate this account of Josephus clearly shews, that even after the massacre, the number of Jews in this country was very considerable: and so far from proving what Pearson asserts, that there were no Jews remaining in the province of Babylonia, when St. Peter wrote, it proves the very reverse. Besides, as St. Peter, at least according to my calculation, wrote his first Epistle twenty years after this massacre, the Jewish population in Babylonia, however greatly it might have suffered, must, in the mean time, have acquired an augmentation. Lastly, it must be observed that in this whole history, no mention whatever is made of any misfortunes, which befel the Jews in the city of Babylon on the Euphrates: and therefore the opinion, that St. Peter wrote his first Epistle there, would not be affected, even if it could be shewn, that the Jews in Seleucia, Ctesiphon, Nisibis, and Nehardea were wholly extirpated.

The second argument in favour of a mystical interpretation of the word Babylon, is, that almost all the ancient fathers have explained it in this manner, and have asserted that St. Peter used it, to denote Rome. But we must recollect, that an assertion of this kind, is not testimony to a fact, but mere matter of opinion, in which the ancients were as liable to mistake, as we are. Nor is it true, that all the ancient ecclesiastical writers have ascribed to the word Babylon a mystical meaning: for though the Greek and Latin fathers commonly understand Rome, yet the Syriac and Arabic writers understand it literally, as denoting a town in the East. And, if we are to be guided by opinion, an oriental writer is surely as good authority on the present question, as an European.

The third objection, on which Lardner particularly insists, is, that in the accounts, which we have on record relative to St. Peter's history, no mention is made of a journey to Babylon. Now this argument would prove nothing, even if our knowledge of St. Peter's life and

tranſactions were more perfect than it really is. Let us ſuppoſe an inſtance of ſome eminent man in modern times, in the hiſtory of whoſe life no mention is made, that during his travels he paid a viſit to Vienna: but that among his letters to his friends, one of them, notwithſtanding the ſilence of his biographer, is dated from Vienna. In this caſe, unleſs we had reaſon to ſuppoſe, either that the whole Epiſtle was a forgery, or that the author had uſed a falſe date, we ſhould immediately conclude on the bare authority of this ſingle Epiſtle, that he had actually been at Vienna; and we ſhould hardly think of a myſtical or ſpiritual Vienna. Lardner himſelf has argued in this very manner, with reſpect to St. Paul, though St. Paul's hiſtory is infinitely better known, than that of St. Peter: and has inferred from the ſingle paſſage, Tit. i. 5. 'for this cauſe left I thee in Crete,' that St. Paul made a voyage to Crete in the year 56, though this voyage is mentioned neither by St. Luke, nor by any other hiſtorian. No reaſon therefore can be aſſigned why we ſhould refuſe to argue in the ſame manner, with reſpect to St. Peter. In fact, Lardner's argument could no where have been more unfortunately applied, than in the preſent inſtance. From the time of the Apoſtolic council at Jeruſalem[t], in the year 49, at which St Peter was preſent, till the time of his arrival in Rome, which Lardner acknowledges was not before 63, there is an interval of fourteen years, during which we have no hiſtory of him whatſoever[u]. How then can we form a judgement of his tranſactions during this period, except from his own writings? And how can the ſilence of hiſtory in reſpect to his journey to Babylon afford an argument that he never was there, in contradiction to his

[t] Acts xv. After this chapter, the name of St. Peter does not once occur in the Acts of the Apoſtles.

[u] Lardner himſelf ſays, in his Supplement, Vol. III. Ch. xviii. Sect. 4. 'we have no where any very diſtinct account of this Apoſtle's travels.' And ſoon afterwards he ſays, 'The books of the New Teſtament afford no light for determining, where St. Peter was for ſeveral years after that.'

his own Epiſtle, when the real fact is, we have no hiſtory at all of St. Peter during this period? We cannot therefore talk of its ſilence in reſpect to any one particular tranſaction, ſince every tranſaction of St. Peter throughout the whole of this interval is left unrecorded. Lardner indeed conjectures, as the Epiſtle is addreſſed to the inhabitants of Pontus, Galatia, &c. that St. Peter ſpent a part of this time in theſe countries, though he denies that St. Peter ever was in Babylon, whence the Epiſtle is dated. Now this mode of arguing is nearly the ſame, as if I concluded from a letter dated from Vienna, and addreſſed to a perſon in Venice, that the writer of that letter had been in Venice, but not, that he ever was at Vienna. Lardner ſuppoſes alſo, that St. Peter ſpent a part of this time in Jeruſalem. Now it is impoſſible for us to determine, what ſtay St. Peter made in Jeruſalem after the holding of the Apoſtolic council, or whether he remained at all there. But this I think is certain, that he was not at Jeruſalem, when St. Paul returned thither for the laſt time,* ſince St. Luke makes particular mention of St. James, and deſcribes him as the head of the Chriſtian community in Jeruſalem, but ſays nothing of St. Peter, whom he would hardly have paſſed over in total ſilence, if St. Peter had been there. Now St. Paul's laſt viſit to Jeruſalem happened in the year 60: and ſince I have ſhewn in the third ſection of this chapter, that the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter was written about this time, it is not at all improbable, that St. Peter, who was abſent from Jeruſalem, was then engaged in preaching the Goſpel to the Babylonians.

The laſt argument in favour of the opinion that the Babylon, where St. Peter wrote, was not Babylon properly ſo called, is derived from ch. ii. 13. where St. Peter commands obedience 'to the king,' and from ch. ii. 17. where he ſays, 'honour the king.' Hence Lardner† concludes,

* Acts xxii. xxiii.

† Supplement, Vol. III. Ch. xix. § 3. n. 3. This argument is peculiar to Lardner.

concludes, that St. Peter must have written in a place, which was subject to the same king or emperor, as the people to which he sent his Epistle. But these were subject to the Roman emperor; whereas Babylon with its whole territory was then subject not to the Romans, but to the Parthians, and therefore according to Lardner could not have been the place, where St. Peter wrote. Now this argument rests on a supposition, which is contradicted by the common usage of every language: the expression 'the king' in a letter from a person in one country to a person in another country, may according to circumstances denote the king, to which the reader is subject, as well as the king, to which the writer is subject.

It appears then, that the arguments, which have been alleged, to shew that St. Peter did not write his first Epistle in the country of Babylonia, are devoid of foundation: and consequently the notion of a mystical Babylon, as denoting either Jerusalem or Rome, loses its whole support[y]. For in itself the notion is highly improbable, and therefore the bare possibility, that St. Peter took a journey to Babylon properly so called, renders it inadmissible. The plain language of epistolary writing does not admit of the figures of poetry: and though it would be very allowable in a poem written in honour of Göttingen to style it another Athens, yet if a professor of this University, should in a letter written from Göttingen, date it Athens, it would be a greater piece of pedantry, than ever was laid to the charge of the learned. In like manner,

[y] For the same reason the opinion that St. Peter meant a small town in Egypt, of the name of Babylon, loses likewise its support: for, if there is no ground for the supposition, that St. Peter did not write either in the neighbourhood of the Tigris or of the Euphrates, we can have no authority for the conjecture, that he wrote in an insignificant town in Egypt. Indeed, very few have adopted it, except the Coptic Christians, who believe that St. Peter wrote this Epistle in Egypt, because he sends a salutation from St. Mark, whom they claim as their Apostle and patron. See Wanleb nouvelle relation d' un voyage fait en Egypte, p. 132. and p. 118. of his manuscript preserved in the library of the University of Göttingen.

manner, though a figurative uſe of the word Babylon is not unſuitable to the animated and poetical language of the Apocalypſe, yet St. Peter in a plain and unadorned Epiſtle would hardly have called the place, where he wrote, by any other appellation than that, which literally and properly belonged to it [z].

SECT. VI.

Of the contents, and the deſign of this Epiſtle.

THE object of this Epiſtle is aſſigned by St. Peter himſelf, ch. v. 12. where he ſays, 'I have written briefly, exhorting, and teſtifying, that this is the true grace of God, wherein ye ſtand.' But I have ſhewn in the firſt ſection of this chapter, that the perſons, to whom he wrote, were uncircumciſed Jewiſh proſelytes, who had received the Chriſtian faith. St. Peter wrote therefore to convince his readers, that, though they were of gentile origin, and had not been circumciſed, they ſtood in the grace of God, as well as the Jewiſh and circumciſed converts to Chriſtianity.

The manner, in which St. Peter has treated this queſtion, is very different from that of St. Paul. For he has not

[z] Whoever wiſhes to know what commentators have defended the myſtical interpretation of the word Babylon may conſult Lardner's Supplement, Vol. III. Ch. xix.. Lardner himſelf has defended this interpretation, and alſo Moſheim, in his preface to Walther's Expoſition of the Epiſtle. It was likewiſe adopted by moſt of the Greek and Latin fathers, and is ſtill received by moſt members of the church of Rome, becauſe they conſider St. Peter as their head, and therefore ſeek for arguments to prove, that he ſpent ſome time among them. Hardouin explains Babylon of Jeruſalem: and according to Aſſeman (Bib. Or. T. III. P. II. p. 7.) it was the opinion of certain Syrians, that St. Peter wrote his firſt Epiſtle, not only in Jeruſalem, but in the very room, where the Apoſtles firſt received the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt.

not divided his Epiſtle into two diſtinct parts, the one doctrinal, the other practical, as St. Paul has uſually done: but has interwoven the doctrines with the exhortations. This remarkable difference in their modes of thinking and writing deſerves particularly to be noted. Several adverſaries of Chriſtianity have aſſerted, that St. Peter's doctrine, in reſpect to the Levitical law, was not the ſame with that of St. Paul, and that St. Peter maintained the neceſſity of this law even for the heathens. Now this aſſertion is not only contradicted by what we read of St. Peter in the Acts of the Apoſtles, but more eſpecially by the very contents of his own Epiſtle. In order therefore to ſupport it with any colour of argument, the firſt ſtep muſt be to deny that the Epiſtle is genuine. It is true, that no one has hitherto had recourſe to this pretext: but leſt any one ſhould have recourſe to it in future, and even contend that St. Paul himſelf wrote this Epiſtle in St. Peter's name in order to remove all ſuſpicion of a difference in their doctrines, I have thought it not unneceſſary to ſhew that St. Paul's manner is totally different from that, which is obſervable in the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter.

Another object, which St. Peter had in view, according to what he ſays, ch. v. 12. was, to exhort. Now the exhortations, which occur in this Epiſtle, beſide ſome occaſional admonitions on idolatry and other heathen vices, may be reduced to the three following claſſes.

1. To patience in misfortunes; whence we may conclude that the Chriſtians in Aſia Minor were then in affliction: and in this reſpect the object of St. Peter's firſt Epiſtle agrees with that of St. James. Theſe exhortations to patience St. Peter has not arranged ſyſtematically, but has introduced them in various places, as opportunities offered, namely, ch. i. 6—11. ii. 21—25. iii. 14.—iv. 7. iv. 12—19. v. 7—11. St. Paul would have placed them more methodically.

2. To avoid whatever might give juſt offence to the magiſtrates and their fellow citizens, and might confirm the

the slanderous reports of their adversaries. St. Peter speaks of slander in more than one place of this Epistle; and he seems to have apprehended, that the magistrates would make an enquiry into the conduct of the Christians. He advises them therefore to be on their guard, to pay particular attention to their own conduct, that they, who spoke evil of them, might be put to silence. He enforces the duty of men towards the magistrates, and of wives towards their husbands: and recommends to the wives, whose husbands were yet unbelievers, not to convert them by disputation, but to win them by their own good conduct. Hence we may conclude, that one of the evil reports, which St. Peter wished principally to remove, was, that the Christian religion contributed to excite sedition on the part of the men, and to cause disobedience on the part of the wives. The exhortations on this subject are delivered likewise in detached parts of the Epistle, namely, ch. ii. 12—20. iii. 1—13. iv. 14—16. v. 7—9. In this last passage the word διαβολος denotes not 'devil,' but 'calumniator.'

3. To brotherly love. This exhortation is principally given in ch. i. 22—ii. 10. and St. Peter enforces it by representing to his readers, that 'they were born again, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever:' and that they were a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation. But a similar exhortation occurs again, ch. iv. 8—11.

SECT. VII.

Of St. Peter's mode of writing, and the peculiarities of his Greek ſtyle.

THIS is a ſubject of ſome importance, becauſe a knowledge of the peculiarities in the language of St. Peter's firſt Epiſtle will beſt enable us to determine, whether the ſecond Epiſtle, the authenticity of which has been called in queſtion, was written by the ſame author or not.

St. Peter frequently quotes the Old Teſtament, according to the text of the Septuagint, and that, even in places, where the Septuagint does not exactly expreſs the ſenſe of the Hebrew: for inſtance, ch. ii. 6. 9. iv. 18 [a]. He has borrowed likewiſe thoughts and expreſſions from the Septuagint in ſeveral paſſages, where he has not made a formal quotation, as in ch. iii. 6. which he borrowed from Prov. iii. 25. and in ch. v. 7. which he borrowed from Pſalm liv. 23. I have thought it the more neceſſary to make this remark, becauſe though St. Paul, or St. Luke, or St. John, even without a compariſon of their quotations with the Hebrew and Greek texts, might be expected to have chiefly uſed the latter, yet of St. Peter it might be ſuppoſed before an actual compariſon had taken place, that he was not converſant with the Greek Bible.

Secondly, in the ſtructure of his periods St. Peter has this peculiarity, that he is fond of beginning a ſentence in ſuch a manner, that it ſhall refer to a principal word in the preceding. Wetſtein in his note to 1 Peter i. 4. has very juſtly ſaid, Obſervant interpretes, Petrum, quod et Johannes in initio evangelii facit, ita ſermonem ſuum ordinare, ut membrum ſequens ex præcedentis fine inchoet, et cum eo connectat. 4. εις ὑμας. 5. τους —φρουρουμενους — εν καιρῳ ἐσχατῳ. 6. ἐν ᾧ. 7.—Ιησου χριστου. 8. ὀν ουκ ειδοτες.

[a] This laſt paſſage muſt be compared with Prov. xi. 31.

εἰδοτες. 9.—σωτηριαν ψυχων. 10. περι ἧς σωτηριας—προφητευσαντες. 11. ερευνωντες. The consequence of this structure is, that the sentences, instead of being rounded, according to the manner of the Greeks, are drawn out to a great length: and in many places, where we should expect, that a sentence would be closed, a new clause is attached, and another again to this, so that, before the whole period comes to an end, it contains parts, which, at the commencement of the period, do not appear to have been designed for it. St. Paul, though he was likewise inattentive to his style, and frequently extends his periods by the insertion of parentheses, yet, if we except the Epistles to the Ephesians [b] and Colossians, he has not injured the rotundity of his periods by such an addition of clause to clause.

Thirdly, St. Peter has made use of several words, which do not frequently occur in other parts of the New Testament: for instance:

Αναστροφη, and αναστρεφομαι, taken in a moral sense, ch. i. 15. 17. 18. ii. 12. iii. 1. 2. 16. It is true that αναστροφη occurs sometimes in other parts of the New Testament: but the frequent use of it in one short Epistle distinguishes St. Peter from the other writers of the New Testament.

Επισκοπος is used by St. Peter, not in the sense of 'bishop,' but in that of 'shepherd,' or 'pastor,' ch. ii. 25. The translation of επισκοπον των ψυχων ὑμων, by 'bishop of your souls,' is surely improper; for the expression 'bishop of our souls' would imply that there was such a thing, as bishop of our bodies. The Hebrew verb רָעָה denoting both pavit, and curavit, St. Peter appears to have used επισκοπος in the same latitude, as corresponding to the participle רֹעֶה, and as denoting both 'shepherd' and 'guardian.' In like manner he appears to have used the verb επισκοπεω in the sense of pascere.

Αἱ αρεται, is used by St. Peter to denote 'praise,' in the same manner, as it is frequently used in the Septuagint [c].

Αμαραντος

[b] See above, Ch. xx. Sect. 5.

[c] See for instance Isaiah xlii. 8. 12. xliii. 21. Habak. iii. 3.

Αμαραντος and αμαραντινος occur in no other part of the New Teſtament, than the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter. In the whole Septuagint likewiſe the latter is not uſed, and the former in only one inſtance.

, Επερωτημα, ch. iii. 21. is uſed in no other place, either in the New Teſtament, or in the Septuagint. But it is once uſed by Theodotion in his Greek verſion of Daniel, ch. iv. 14.

Κοσμος, ch. v. 9. appears to be uſed in a ſenſe very different from its uſual one: for if we tranſlate it 'world' the meaning of the paſſage will be, 'it happens in the world, as it happens to you in Aſia Minor, which ſounds rather ſtrange. Perhaps in the Eaſt, the term 'world' was uſed to denote the Parthian Empire, as in the Weſt it denoted the Roman Empire.

CHAP. XXVIII.

OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

SECT. I.

Of the authenticity of this Epiſtle.

THIS Epiſtle, as appears from ch. iii. 1. was written to the ſame communities as the firſt Epiſtle: and the author thus gives us to underſtand, that he was the perſon who wrote the firſt Epiſtle, that is, the Apoſtle Peter. He calls himſelf likewiſe, ch. i. 1. Συμεων Πετρος, δουλος και αποστολος Ιησου Χριστου: and ch. i. 16—18. ſays, that he was preſent at the tranſfiguration of Chriſt on the mount. The notion therefore entertained by Grotius, that this Epiſtle was written by a biſhop of Jeruſalem,

lem, of the name of Simeon, is abſolutely inadmiſſible. And we have no other alternative than this: either it was written by the Apoſtle St. Peter, or it is a forgery in his name.

The ancients entertained very great doubts, whether St. Peter was really the author. Euſebius, in the chapter[d] where he ſpeaks of the books of the New Teſtament in general, reckons it among the αντιλεγομενα. He ſays that tradition does not reckon, as a part of the New Teſtament, the ſecond Epiſtle aſcribed to Peter: but that, as in the opinion of moſt men, it is uſeful, it is therefore much read. Origen had ſaid long before (as quoted, Euſeb. H. E. VI. 25.) that Peter had left behind him one Epiſtle univerſally received; and perhaps a ſecond, though doubts were entertained about it. Writers of the fifth and following centuries, or the decrees of councils, I think it unneceſſary to quote, eſpecially as they have been already quoted by Lardner.

The old Syriac verſion, though it contains the Epiſtle of St. James, which Euſebius likewiſe reckons among the αντιλεγομενα, does not contain the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter. Now it cannot be ſaid, that the other books of the New Teſtament were tranſlated into Syriac before St. Peter's ſecond Epiſtle was written; for St. Paul's ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy was written certainly as late[e], and yet is contained in this very verſion. And if an Epiſtle addreſſed only to an individual was known to the Syriac tranſlator, it may be thought that a circular Epiſtle, addreſſed to communities diſperſed in ſeveral countries in Aſia, would hardly have eſcaped his notice. The circumſtance therefore, that the old Syriac tranſlator did not tranſlate the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, as well as the firſt, may be uſed as an argument againſt its antiquity, and, of courſe, againſt its authenticity. However, we muſt not immediately conclude, that the Syrian church condemned this Epiſtle

[d] Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. III. cap. 25.

[e] The Goſpel of St. John, which is likewiſe in the Syrian canon, was written ſtill later.

Epiſtle as ſpurious, though it is not contained in their ancient verſion. For Ephrem, a Syrian writer of the fourth century, has not only quoted ſeveral paſſages from it, but has expreſsly aſcribed it to St. Peter[f]. And Aſſeman, in his Catalogue of the Vatican manuſcripts[g], gives an account of a Syriac lectionary, uſed formerly in a church at Antioch, which contains a leſſon from this Epiſtle. This lectionary appears to have been uſed by the ſect of Monophyſites[h]: but whether other Syrian ſects, eſpecially the Neſtorians, likewiſe made uſe of lectionaries, which contained leſſons from this Epiſtle, is a matter of doubt. Nor muſt we conclude that, becauſe leſſons from this Epiſtle have in later ages been read in Syrian churches, the Epiſtle was alſo read in the primitive Syrian church. For lectionaries differ very frequently from each other in the choice of the leſſons, which they contain: and therefore we cannot argue from the contents of one, which was uſed in the ſeventh or eighth century, to the contents of one, which was uſed in the firſt or ſecond.

It

[f] In the ſecond volume of his Greek works, p. 387. he ſays, Βοᾷ δὲ καὶ ὁ μακαριος Πετρος, ὁ κορυφαιος των αποστολων, περι της ἡμερας ἐκεινης, λεγων· Ἡ ἡμερα κυριου ὡς κλεπτης ἐν νυκτι, οὕτως ἐρχεται, δι' ἣν οὐρανοι παρελευσονται λυθησονται, και στοιχεια καυσουμενα τηκεται. This is a quotation from 2 Pet. iii. 10. 12.

[g] Vol. II. p. 170.

[h] The leſſon begins with 2 Pet. i. 10. and, as far as I can judge from what is quoted by Aſſeman, was taken, not from any ancient Syriac verſion, but from the Philoxenian verſion of this Epiſtle, the ſame as is contained in our common editions of the Syriac New Teſtament, (ſee Vol. II. of this Introduction, Ch. vii. Sect. 10.) except only, that there is a ſmall difference in the orthography. This lectionary therefore was uſed by the ſect of the Monophyſites, but not by all the Syrian ſects. In our common printed editions of the Syriac New Teſtament, 2 Pet. i. 10. is worded thus, ܐܣܬ ܣܘ̈ܦ ܕܒܝܫ ܗܘ ܕܢܥܒܕ ܒܟ ܒܥܠܡ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܘܠܐ ܢܬܟܫܠ ܒܟ ܒܥܠܡ ܕܐܠܗܐ. The paſſage quoted by Aſſeman from the Lectionary is, ܐܣܬ ܐܣ̈ܦ ܕܒܝܫ ܗܘ ܕܢܥܒܕ ܒܟ ܒܥܠܡ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܘܠܐ ܢܬܟܫܠ ܒܟ ܒܥܠܡ ܕܐܠܗܐ. Here ܒܝܫ is nothing more than an abbreviation for ܒܝܫܘܬܐ, or, as Aſſeman ſuppoſes, is a mere erratum of the copyiſt.

It appears then, that, if the authenticity of this Epiſtle, were to be determined by external evidence, it would have leſs in its favour, than it would have againſt it. But, on the other hand, the internal evidence is greatly in its favour, and indeed ſo much ſo, that the Epiſtle gains in this reſpect more, than it loſes in the former. Wetſtein indeed ſays, that ſince the ancients themſelves were in doubt, the moderns cannot expect to arrive at certainty, becauſe we cannot obtain more information on the ſubject, in the eighteenth, than eccleſiaſtical writers were able to obtain in the third and fourth centuries. Now this is perfectly true, as far as relates to hiſtorical knowledge, or to the teſtimony of others, in regard to the matter of fact, whether St. Peter was the author or not. But when this queſtion is to be decided by an examination of the Epiſtle itſelf, it is ſurely poſſible, that the critical ſkill and penetration of the moderns may diſcover in it proofs of its having been written by St. Peter, though theſe proofs eſcaped the notice of the ancients.

After a diligent compariſon of the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter with that, which is aſcribed to him as his ſecond, the agreement between them appears to me to be ſuch, that, if the ſecond was not written by St. Peter, as well as the firſt, the perſon, who forged it, not only poſſeſſed the power of imitation in a very unuſual degree, but underſtood likewiſe the deſign of the firſt Epiſtle, with which the ancients do not appear to have been acquainted. Now, if this be true, the ſuppoſition that the ſecond Epiſtle was not written by St. Peter himſelf involves a contradiction. Nor is it credible, that a pious impoſtor of the firſt or ſecond century ſhould have imitated St. Peter ſo ſucceſsfully as to betray no marks of a forgery: for the ſpurious productions of thoſe ages, which were ſent into the world under the name of Apoſtles, are for the moſt part very unhappy imitations, and diſcover very evident marks, that they were not written by the perſons, to whom they were aſcribed. Other productions of this kind betray their origin

origin by the poverty of their materials, or by the circumſtance, that inſtead of containing original thoughts, they are nothing more than a rhapſody of ſentiments collected from various parts of the Bible, and put together without plan or order. This charge cannot poſſibly be laid to the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, which is ſo far from containing materials derived from other parts of the Bible, that the third chapter exhibits the diſcuſſion of a totally new ſubject. Its reſemblance to the Epiſtle of St. Jude will be hardly urged, as an argument againſt it: for no doubt can be made, that the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter was, in reſpect to the Epiſtle of St. Jude, the original, and not the copy. Laſtly, it is extremely difficult even for a man of the greateſt talents, to forge a writing in the name of another, without ſometimes inſerting, what the pretended author either would not, or could not have ſaid; and to ſupport the impoſture in ſo complete a manner, as to militate in not a ſingle inſtance, either againſt his character, or againſt the age, in which he lived. Now in the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, though it has been a ſubject of examination full ſeventeen hundred years, nothing has hitherto been diſcovered, which is unſuitable, either to the Apoſtle, or to the Apoſtolic age. Objections indeed have been made on account of its ſtyle: but theſe objections I ſhall preſently anſwer, and ſhew that the ſtyle of the ſecond Epiſtle, when compared with that of the firſt, warrants rather the concluſion, that both were written by the ſame perſon. We have no reaſon therefore to believe, that the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter is ſpurious, eſpecially as it is difficult to comprehend what motive could have induced a Chriſtian, whether orthodox, or heretic, to attempt the fabrication of ſuch an Epiſtle, and then falſely aſcribe it to St. Peter.

Having ſhewn, that the ſuppoſition, that this Epiſtle is ſpurious, is without foundation, I have in the next place to ſhew, that there are poſitive grounds for believing it to be genuine. The arguments in favour of

its

its genuineneſs are of two kinds, being founded on the ſimilarity of the two Epiſtles, either in reſpect to their materials, or in reſpect to their ſtyle. The arguments of the former kind are as follow:

1. The deſign of the firſt Epiſtle was to aſſure the uncircumciſed Chriſtians, that they ſtood in the grace of God, as I have ſhewn in the preceding chapter. Now it was not generally known, that this was the deſign of it, and therefore we cannot ſuppoſe, that any perſon, whoſe object was to forge an Epiſtle in St. Peter's name, ſhould have obſerved it. But the deſign of the ſecond Epiſtle was certainly the ſame as that of the firſt, as appears from the addreſs, ch. i. 1. Τοις ισοτιμον ἡμιν λαχουσι πιστιν εν δικαιοσυνη του Θεου. If we explain ἡμιν as denoting 'us Apoſtles,' the addreſs will imply what was wholly unneceſſary, ſince no one could doubt that the faith of other Chriſtians might be as good, as the faith of the Apoſtles: and it will ſound likewiſe rather haughty and aſſuming. But if we explain ἡμιν as denoting 'us who were born Jews,' and conſider, that the ſecond Epiſtle, as well as the firſt, was directed to perſons who were born heathens, the addreſs becomes clear and conſiſtent. Δικαιοσυνη του Θεου will then ſignify 'the impartiality of God' in eſtimating the faith of native heathens as highly as the faith of native Jews, which St. Peter has extolled in other places[1]. We ſhall likewiſe be able to explain ch. i. 8—10. which appears to contain the tautology, that they who are diligent in good works, are not idle: whereas, if this Epiſtle be explained from the deſign of the firſt, we ſhall perceive the meaning of the paſſage to be this; that they, who are diligent in good works, need not fear the reproach, that they obſerve not the Levitical law, ſince their good works, which are the fruits of their religious knowledge, will make their calling and election ſure.

The deluge, which is not a common ſubject in the Apoſtolic Epiſtles, is mentioned both in 1 Pet. iii. 20. and in 2 Pet. ii. 5. and in both places the circumſtance is

[1] Acts x. 34, 35. xv. 8, 9. 1 Pet. i. 17.

is noted, that eight perſons only were ſaved, though, in neither place does the ſubject require that the number ſhould be particularly ſpecified. Now it is true that St. Peter was not the only Apoſtle, who knew how many perſons were ſaved in the ark: but he only, who by habit had acquired a familiarity with the ſubject, would aſcertain the preciſe number; where his argument did not depend upon it.

3. The author of the firſt Epiſtle had read St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Romans, as I have ſhewn in the ſecond ſection of the preceding chapter: and the author of the ſecond Epiſtle ſpeaks in expreſs terms, ch. iii. 15, 16. of the Epiſtles of St. Paul. Now no other writer of the New Teſtament has quoted from the New Teſtament: conſequently we have in theſe Epiſtles a criterion, from which we may judge that they were written by the ſame author.

Before I conſider the arguments which are derived from the ſtyle of theſe Epiſtles, I muſt obſerve that ſeveral commentators have, on the contrary, contended that the ſtyle is very different, and hence have inferred that they were written by different authors. Jerom likewiſe, in his treatiſe on Illuſtrious Men, ſays that on this very account it was believed, that the ſecond Epiſtle was not written by St. Peter. Now I will not deny that the ſtyle of the ſecond Epiſtle in ſome places, eſpecially in the ſecond chapter, is ſomewhat different from the ſtyle of the firſt Epiſtle: but if they agree in other places, theſe exceptions will not prove, that the Epiſtles were not written by the ſame author. It is extremely difficult to form from a ſingle Epiſtle ſo complete a judgement of the author's ſtyle and manner, as to enable us to pronounce with certainty, that he was not the author of another Epiſtle, which is aſcribed to him. The ſtyle of the ſame writer is not always the ſame at every period of his life, eſpecially when he compoſes, not in his native, but in a foreign language. Let us examine however in what the difference between theſe Epiſtles conſiſts.

Camerarius,

Camerarius, in his note on 1 Pet. v. 12. ſays of the firſt Epiſtle, Hoc diſſimulandum non putavimus, hanc epiſtolam bonis et ſignificantibus verbis refertam, atque adeo ipſam compoſitionem ejuſmodi eſſe, quæ, ut in neglectione hujus ſtudii, præclara videri poſſit; ut diligenter et accurate iſtam epiſtolam perſcriptam eſſe appareat. But of the ſecond Epiſtle he ſays in his note on 2 Pet. i. 3. Sunt autem in hac epiſtola et verba, et figuræ ſermonis ejuſmodi in pleriſque locis, ut ſententia ambigua atque obſcura reddatur, magis quam uſpiam alibi in ſcriptis apoſtolicis. Now every one will allow that on this ſubject Camerarius was a competent judge, and I readily grant that he had ſome foundation for his cenſure of the ſecond Epiſtle, in the place where he has given it, namely in ch. i. 1—7. But he has carried the matter too far in adding 'in pleriſque locis,' and in extending his cenſure to the whole Epiſtle. For after the 12th verſe of ch. i. to the end of the Epiſtle, the words are very intelligible, and very properly choſen: and in reſpect to the ſtructure of the periods, the paſſage[k] ch. ii. 4—10. is more judiciouſly arranged and is better rounded, than any ſentence of the ſame length in the firſt Epiſtle. If there is any obſcurity in it, this muſt be aſcribed partly to our own want of knowledge, becauſe, the erroneous doctrines combated in the ſecond chapter are not ſufficiently underſtood, and partly to the circumſtance, that the author has not given us to underſtand, till toward the cloſe of the Epiſtle, that he wrote againſt the deniers of a day of judgement. But this very circumſtance affords a ſtrong argument, that both Epiſtles were written by the ſame author: for in the firſt Epiſtle likewiſe the purport of it is not declared before the end of the laſt chapter[l], ſo that the demonſtration precedes the propoſition, whence this Epiſtle alſo was not thoroughly underſtood even by Camerarius, though he thought it perfectly intelligible.

With

[k] This paſſage ends with the word καταφρονητας ver. 10.—Τολμηται begins a new ſentence.

[l] Ch. v. 13.

With reſpect to the paſſage in the ſecond Epiſtle, ch. i. 3. where Camerarius complains, and not wholly without foundation, of obſcurity, it may be obſerved that Alberti's remarks on it have rendered it leſs obſcure than it appeared to Camerarius, and that the difficulty, which attends it, is owing to the two following cauſes:

1. To the reading διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, which is that of our common printed editions, and for which Camerarius did not know that there was a better. But ſince his time, it has been diſcovered that very good authorities, inſtead of this reading, have ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ. Now if we adopt the latter reading, and conſtrue in the following manner, 'through the knowledge of God in his glory,' we ſhall no longer have reaſon to complain of obſcurity.

2. To the circumſtance, that the ſame word ἀρετη is uſed, ver. 3. and ver. 5. in two different ſenſes, and that its common meaning 'virtue' is applicable in neither place. But this very word is uſed likewiſe in the firſt Epiſtle in a peculiar ſenſe, though few commentators have obſerved it; and conſequently the obſcurity, which attends ἀρετη, 2 Pet. i. 3. is rather an argument, that both Epiſtles were written by the ſame perſon. In 2 Pet. i. 5. this favourite word of St. Peter ſignifies 'glory;' and ver. 5. it denotes 'courage,' eſpecially that kind of courage, which muſt attend the faith of a true Chriſtian, but which at the ſame time muſt be accompanied with knowledge, that they, who poſſeſs it, may not become undaunted martyrs of error and prejudice.

Thus, in anſwering the objections, which have been made to the ſtyle of the ſecond Epiſtle, I have likewiſe ſhewn ſome inſtances of agreement with that of the firſt. To theſe may be added the following:

1. The ſentences in the ſecond Epiſtle are ſeldom fluent and well rounded, but have the ſame extenſion as thoſe in the firſt.

2. Ἀναστροφη, the word ſo peculiar to the firſt Epiſtle, occurs likewiſe in the ſecond[m], though not ſo frequently as

[m] Ch. ii. 7. iii. 11.

as in the former. On the other hand we ſometimes find in the ſecond Epiſtle repetitions of the ſame word, which betray a poverty of language: for inſtance επιχορηγεω, ch. i. 5. 11. σπευδαζω, ch. i. 10. 15.

From what has been ſaid in the courſe of this ſection, it appears, that even the ſecond chapter of the ſecond Epiſtle has ſome reſemblance, both in its ſtyle and its contents, to the firſt Epiſtle. This is particularly to be noted, becauſe even the advocates for the ſecond Epiſtle have in general granted, that the ſtyle of this chapter is not the uſual ſtyle of St. Peter. Biſhop Sherlock for inſtance acknowledges it: nor, though I contend that there is ſome ſimilarity, as in ver. 5. 7., will I aſſert that there is no difference. But it will not therefore follow that the whole Epiſtle was not written by St. Peter: and if it is allowable to draw a concluſion from one or two pages, it will be no other than this, that the ſecond chapter is ſpurious, becauſe the ſtyle of it is ſaid to be as different from the firſt and third chapters, as it is from the firſt Epiſtle. This concluſion however no one will draw, who has examined the connexion of the whole Epiſtle[a]. In fact the difference in queſtion is rather of a negative kind: for though I am unable to diſcover any remarkable agreement in ſtyle between the firſt Epiſtle and the ſecond chapter of the ſecond Epiſtle, I do not perceive any remarkable difference. This ſecond chapter has indeed ſeveral words, which are unuſual in other parts of the New Teſtament: but the ſame may be ſaid of the firſt Epiſtle. And ſome of the expreſſions, which to us appear extraordinary, were borrowed perhaps from the Gnoſtics, whoſe doctrines are here confuted: for it is not unuſual, in combating the opinions of a particular ſect, to adopt their peculiar terms. Thus in 2 Pet. ii. 17. the Gnoſtics are called 'clouds agitated by a tempeſt:' and we know that the Manicheans, who had many doctrines in common with the Gnoſtics, taught that there were five good, and five bad elements, and that one

[a] This ſubject will be particularly examined in the laſt ſection of this chapter.

one of the latter was called 'tempeſt'[o]. In like manner, they frequently ſpeak of darkneſs under the name of Ζοφος, which occurs more than once in this chapter. The Epiſtle of St. Jude has a ſtill greater number of unuſual figurative expreſſions; and it is not impoſſible, that theſe alſo were borrowed from the Gnoſtics.

SECT. II.

Of the time, when this Epiſtle was written.

THE ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter muſt have been written only a ſhort time before his death: for he ſays, ch. i. 14. 'ſhortly I muſt put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath ſhewed me.' St. Peter here alludes to his converſation with Chriſt after the reſurrection, recorded in John xxi. 18—22. where Chriſt had foretold his death in the following words, 'when thou ſhalt be old, thou ſhalt ſtretch forth thy hands, and another ſhall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldeſt not.' Hence St. Peter might very eaſily conclude, that he would not ſurvive the coming of Chriſt to judge Jeruſalem. But Chriſt has declared that Jeruſalem would be deſtroyed before one generation paſſed away. St. Peter therefore after a lapſe of thirty years, that is in the year 64, neceſſarily conſidered his death, as an event not far diſtant.

On the place, where this Epiſtle was written I ſay nothing: for it is wholly uncertain, whether St. Peter wrote it before, or after his arrival in Rome.

[o] Beauſobre Hiſt. des Manichéens. Tom. II. p. 300, 301.

SECT. III.

Of the deſign of this Epiſtle.

I HAVE already obſerved in the firſt ſection of this chapter, that the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter was addreſſed to Chriſtians, who were born heathens. The purport of it is chiefly polemical; and it is evident, eſpecially from the laſt chapter of the Epiſtle, that St. Peter wrote againſt certain perſons, who, though members of the church, denied the doctrine of a general judgment, and a diſſolution of the world[p]. They inferred

[p] This is not admitted by Wetſtein, who contends that the laſt chapter of this Epiſtle relates, not to the end of the world, but to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. That this however is not true, will appear from the following conſiderations. Firſt, St. Peter repreſents the fact, for which he argues, as poſſible, by appealing to the deluge. Now no man would appeal to the deluge, to ſhow the poſſibility, that a city may be taken and deſtroyed: but we may very properly argue, that, as the earth has already undergone a material change, ſo it may undergo another change equally great. And what St. Peter ſays, is conſonant to the Jewiſh theology, in which was taught the doctrine, that the earth was deſtined to ſuffer two grand revolutions, the one effected by water, the other to be effected by fire. See Joſeph. Antiq. I. 3. 3. Secondly, no one could doubt, that Jeruſalem would be deſtroyed, merely becauſe the deſtruction was deferred longer than he expected, and ſtill leſs, becauſe 'all things continued as they were from the beginning of the creation,' ch. iii. 4. This ground of doubt manifeſtly implies, that the queſtion related to a revolution of the earth. Thirdly, I know of no heretics, who called in queſtion Chriſt's prophecy of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. And, even if there were ſuch, it is hardly credible that St. Peter ſhould write an Epiſtle to perſons, who were born heathens, and lived in the northern part of Aſia Minor, to prove an event, with which they had little or no concern. Fourthly, what St. Peter ſays ch. iii. 8. 'that one day is with the Lord as a thouſand years, and a thouſand years as one day,' is not very applicable to an event, which was to take place within ſix or ſeven years after St. Peter wrote. Laſtly, if we explain what St. Peter ſays, as relating to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, we muſt take his expreſſions in a figurative ſenſe: but figurative language, though it is well adapted to a prophecy, ſuch as that which is recorded Matth. xxiv., is not very ſuitable to a plain doctrinal diſſertation, eſpecially to one delivered in the form of an Epiſtle.

ferred that this event, becauſe it had been long delayed, would never take place: to which objection St. Peter replies, by ſaying; that one day is with the Lord as a thouſand years, and a thouſand years as one day; that the Lord is not ſlack concerning his promiſe, as ſome men count ſlackneſs, but is long ſuffering, not willing that any man ſhould periſh, but that all ſhould come to repentance. Further, St. Peter argues that, as the earth has already undergone a great revolution at the deluge, another revolution equally great, is not incredible; and that, ſince the former event was at the time, when it happened, as unexpected, as the latter will be, we ought to believe in God's declaration that the world will one day be totally deſtroyed. This deſtruction St. Peter ſays, will be effected not by water, as at the deluge, but by fire: 'the elements ſhall melt with fervent heat, the earth alſo, and the works that are therein ſhall be burned up.' Now a general conflagration will be more eaſily admitted by thoſe who are acquainted with the ſtate of the earth, than an univerſal deluge: for though it may be difficult to comprehend, whence a ſufficient quantity of water could be brought to cover the whole earth, yet no one can deny that the bowels of the earth abound with inflammable matter, and that fiery eruptions may ſpread themſelves throughout the ſurface of the globe.

It muſt be obſerved that St. Peter's appeal to the deluge in the time of Noah, implies that the adverſaries, whom he combats, admitted that the Moſaic account of it was true, ſince it would have been uſeleſs to have argued from a fact, which they denied. This muſt be kept in view, becauſe it will aſſiſt us in determining who theſe adverſaries were.

The polemical part of this Epiſtle is not confined wholly to the third or laſt chapter, for it begins in the ſecond, where St. Peter argues ver. 4—10. from the puniſhment already inflicted and hereafter to be inflicted on the fallen angels, as well as from the deſtruction of the antediluvian world, and of Sodom and Gomorrah,

that God is juſt, and that he will hereafter puniſh ſinners. This again implies, that the perſons, whoſe opinions St. Peter combats, not only believed the Moſaic hiſtory, but likewiſe the account of the fallen angels, their preſent baniſhment from heaven, and the more ſevere puniſhment which ſtill awaited them. Hence therefore we have a ſecond criterion, to aſſiſt us in determining St. Peter's adverſaries.

If we go back to the firſt chapter, the end of which is cloſely connected with the beginning of the ſecond, we ſhall perceive that theſe falſe teachers aſſerted, either that the Chriſtian doctrine was only an inſtructive fable (μυθος σεσοφισμενος) or that divine revelation contained contradictions. The latter aſſertion has been ſupported by many, who made their philoſophy the baſis of their faith, and admitted only ſo much of divine revelation as agreed with their own ſyſtem. This fundamental error he removes by ſaying, ch. i. 20. that divine Scripture cannot contradict itſelf, and ch. xi. 1. that if two prophets diſagree, one of them muſt be a falſe prophet [q].

Further, St. Peter deſcribes theſe falſe teachers ch. ii. 10, 11, 12. as calumniators of the angels, which the Apoſtle highly cenſures, even though the calumny ſhould be directed againſt the fallen angels, ſince ſome reſpect is due to their former greatneſs and power. St. Peter ſays; 'Angels themſelves, which are greater in power and might, bring not railing accuſation againſt them before the Lord: but theſe as natural brute beaſts made to be taken and deſtroyed, ſpeak of the things which they underſtand not.' Here we have a deſcription of theſe falſe teachers, which points them out more diſtinctly than any of the preceding accounts, and ſhews that they were Gnoſtics. For though eccleſiaſtical hiſtory furniſhes many examples of improper adoration paid to the angels, I know of no ſect, which calumniated them, except that of the Gnoſtics. Now the Gnoſtics calumniated the angels

[q] See my treatiſe, De indiciis philoſophiæ Gnoſticæ tempore LXX. interpretum, et Philonis, § 8. in the ſecond volume of the Syntagma commentationum, p. 266, 267.

angels by their doctrine in reſpect to the creation of the world. They raiſed certain angels to the rank of creators, but deſcribed the creation as very imperfect, and the authors of it as wicked and rebellious againſt the Supreme Being. Nay, ſome of them converted the creator of the world into the prince of darkneſs, and invented againſt him the moſt ſcandalous fables.

Another deſcription, which St. Peter gives of theſe falſe teachers, though it is ſomewhat ambiguous, yet when properly explained corroborates the opinion, that theſe falſe teachers were Gnoſtics. He deſcribes them ch. ii. 1. As 'denying the Lord, that bought them.' Here I cannot ſuppoſe that St. Peter meant the Lord Jeſus: for, not to inſiſt on the argument that the word δεσποτης is uſed in the Greek, and not κυριος the uſual appellation of Chriſt, it is inconceivable how any ſet of men could deny the Lord Jeſus, and ſtill be conſidered as Chriſtians. But theſe very perſons were actually ranked among the Chriſtians, as appears from the paſſage in queſtion. By δεσποτης therefore I underſtand God the Father, whom the Gnoſtics denied, by aſſerting that he was not the Creator of the univerſe, which according to their ſyſtem was created by an inferior being.

Having thus ſhewn that St. Peter in his ſecond Epiſtle combats the opinions of a Gnoſtic ſect, I will now venture to go a ſtep further, and attempt to determine the name, which the orthodox gave to this particular ſect, in the firſt century. St. Peter deſcribes them ch. ii. 15. as, 'following the way of Balaam,' that is, as following the religious doctrine of Balaam. The doctrine of Balaam, as St. John ſays, Apoc. ii. 14. was 'to eat things ſacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication.' And ſince Nicolaus in Greek has the ſame meaning as Balaam in Hebrew, the followers of Balaam are called by St. John, Apoc. ii. 15. Nicolaites. Now it is well known that the Nicolaites were a ſect of the Gnoſtics: and therefore it is probable, that this was the ſect againſt which St. Peter wrote.

To

To this opinion it has been objected, that if St. Peter had meant the Nicolaites, he would have called them, not followers of Balaam, but by their proper name, Nicolaites; first, because in general proper names are retained, and not translated, and secondly, because in the present instance no one, before Cocceius, observed the analogy between the Hebrew word Balaam and the Greek word Nicolaus. But neither of these reasons is true. For to say nothing of the general custom, which once prevailed among the literati in Germany, of translating their names into Greek or into Latin, I could produce examples of such translations among the Jews, of which it will be sufficient to mention that which occurs in Acts ix. 36. And the derivation of the Nicolaites from Balaam must have been long known, at least in Asia; for in the Arabic version published by Erpenius, we find an instance of it, in Apoc. ii. 6. where τα εργα των Νικολαιτων is rendered اعمال الشعوبب, that is, 'works of the Shuaibites.' Now the Arabic word شعيب (Shuaib) is equivalent to the Hebrew Balaam[r].

Two difficulties still remain respecting the opinion, that St. Peter wrote against the Gnostics. The one is, that St. Peter's adversaries denied, that there would be a day of general judgment; and it does not appear from the account, which we have of the Gnostics, that they ever made a positive declaration of this kind, at least in the manner in which St. Peter's adversaries made it. But if they did not deny this doctrine in positive terms, they denied

[r] Shuaib is mentioned in the Koran, (Sura vii. 86. xxvi. 176. and in other places) as the prophet of the Midianites. Some suppose that by Shuaib is meant Jethro, but in my opinion no other person is meant than Balaam, who was sent for by the Midianites, as well as by the Moabites. At least, I cannot comprehend how the Nicolaites, or any other heretics, could be considered as followers of Jethro. The Arabic verb شعب signifies perdidit, and the noun شعب populus. It is not improbable therefore that the Arabs adopted the word شعيب as corresponding to the Hebrew word בלעם, which is compounded of בלע absorpsit, perdidit, and עם populus.

denied it virtually by maintaining principles, which are inconſiſtent with it. For they believed in a metempſychoſis, and aſſerted, that the ſouls of men would tranſmigrate from their preſent bodies, in which they were confined as it were in a priſon, into other ſucceſſive bodies, till at laſt they would return to the ſource from which they had derived their origin. They maintained therefore a general reſtoration of the ſouls of men, and conſequently could not believe in the doctrine, that there would be a general judgment, at which the ſouls of the wicked would be condemned to eternal puniſhment. If they admitted the influence of an evil ſpirit on the ſouls of the wicked, as ſome of the Manicheans did, ſtill this influence was only temporary, was exerted only in an intermediate ſtate, and in order to produce amendment, that all men might be finally happy. However it was not inconſiſtent with the Gnoſtic principles, to ſuppoſe, that the fallen angels, who according to their own ſyſtem were the cauſe of all the evil in the world, and were wholly incapable of amendment, were at preſent in a ſtate of miſery, and would receive ſtill greater puniſhment hereafter. It is certain that the Manicheans ſuppoſed ſo[a], though they believed that the ſouls of men, with the exception only of the perſecutors of the truth, would be perfectly happy: and though Manes, the founder of this ſect, lived long after St. Peter, yet he was not the inventor of his whole ſyſtem, for he had adopted many tenets which had been maintained by the Gnoſtics.

The other difficulty is, that St. Peter's adverſaries denied, that the world would one day be deſtroyed by a general conflagration, and we have no authority for ſayings that this was denied by the Gnoſtics. On the contrary the Manicheans admitted this doctrine, and it is perfectly conſonant to the ſyſtem of the Gnoſtics. For, as on the one hand they, who maintained the eternity of the world, argued from the wiſdom and the perfection of the Creator, the Gnoſtics on the other hand,

[a] Beauſobre Hiſt. des Manichéens. Liv. viii. ch. 5.

hand, who aſſerted that the world was created by a being, who had neither wiſdom nor benevolence; might reaſonably conclude, that it was ſo imperfect, as to be incapable of eternal duration. However, as the different ſects of the Gnoſtics maintained ſuch different principles, it is not impoſſible that ſome of them believed in the eternity of the world, ſince their notions of its imperfection did not neceſſarily imply a ceſſation of duration[t].

Laſtly, ſome of the Gnoſtics had a ſevere, others a looſe ſyſtem of morality. And that St. Peter's adverſaries belonged, not to the firſt, but to the ſecond claſs, is evident from what he ſays againſt them in the ſecond chapter.

CHAP. XXIX.

OF THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE[u].

SECT. I.

Of the author of this Epiſtle, whether he was an Apoſtle, called Jude, or whether he was Jude the brother-in-law of Jeſus.

IN the firſt ſection of the twenty-ſixth chapter I have ſtated at large the various opinions, which have been entertained relative to the James and the Jude, whom the

[t] Philo, who was contemporary with St. Peter, wrote a treatiſe, De incorruptibilitate mundi, in which he defended a doctrine contrary to that delivered by St. Peter. But Philo was not a Gnoſtic: nor was he one of thoſe 'ſcoffers,' of whom St. Peter complains.

[u] Though the Epiſtle of St. Jude is placed the laſt among the Catholic Epiſtles, I introduce it here immediately after the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, on account of the great reſemblance, which theſe two Epiſtles bear to each other.

the Evangeliſts[w] call brothers of Jeſus. To that ſection therefore I muſt refer the reader, becauſe the queſtion, which was there examined, has very material influence on the deciſion of our preſent queſtion[x]. If, according to one of the opinions ſtated in the ſection juſt mentioned, James and Jude, whom the Evangeliſts call brothers of Jeſus, were in fact only couſins, or relations, and were ſons, not of Joſeph, but of Alphæus, theſe two perſons were the ſame as the two brothers James and Jude, who were Apoſtles[y]. And in this caſe Jude, the author of our Epiſtle, was the ſame as the Apoſtle Jude, the brother of James, who was ſon of Alphæus: or, at leaſt, if the Epiſtle be a forgery, it was a forgery in his name. On the other hand, if the James and the Jude, whom the Evangeliſts call brothers of Jeſus, were not the two brothers of this name, who were Apoſtles, but were the ſons of Joſeph, the reputed father of Jeſus, we have then two different perſons of the name of Jude, either of which might have written this Epiſtle. And in this caſe we have to examine, whether the Epiſtle was written by an Apoſtle of the name of Jude, or by Jude the brother-in-law of Chriſt.

The author of the Epiſtle himſelf has aſſumed neither the title of Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, nor of brother of Jeſus Chriſt, but calls himſelf only 'Jude the ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, and brother of James.' Now as the author diſtinguiſhes himſelf by the title 'brother of James,'

[w] Matth. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3.

[x] In our preſent inquiry there is alſo another queſtion involved, relative to Adæus, or Thaddæus, the Apoſtle of the Syrians, as will appear in the ſequel.

[y] To prevent miſtakes on this ſubject, it is neceſſary to obſerve, that in the liſt of the twelve Apoſtles given by St. Matthew, ch. x. 2—4. and St. Mark, ch. iii. 16—19. the name of Jude, a brother of James, who was ſon of Alphæus, does not occur. It occurs however in both of the liſts which are given by St. Luke, in his Goſpel, ch. vi. 16. and in the Acts, ch. i. 13.: for in both places we find Ιουδας Ιακωβου, by which is meant Ιουδας αδελφος Ιακωβου. And though St. Matthew and St. Mark have not mentioned this Apoſtle by the name of Ιουδας, they have ſtill mentioned him, but under a different name. St. Mark ch. iii. 18. calls him Θαδδαιος, and St. Matthew, ch. x. 3. names him Λεββαιος, ὁ ἐπικληθεις Θαδδαιος.

James,' and this was a common name among the Jews, he undoubtedly meant ſome eminent perſon of this name, who was well known at the time when he wrote, or the title 'brother of James' would have been no mark of diſtinction. We may infer therefore, that the author of this Epiſtle, was brother either of the Apoſtle James, the ſon of Alphæus, or of James called the brother of Jeſus, or of both, if they were one and the ſame perſon.

The firſt queſtion to be aſked therefore is, Was the author of this Epiſtle the Apoſtle Jude, who was brother of James the ſon of Alphæus. Now I have already obſerved, that this queſtion *muſt* be anſwered in the affirmative, if James and Jude, who were called brothers of Jeſus, were the ſame as the two brothers, James and Jude, who were Apoſtles. And it *may* be anſwered in the affirmative, even if they were different perſons: for Jude, the author of our Epiſtle, had in either caſe a brother of the name of James, and therefore might in either caſe call himſelf, 'Jude the brother of James.' I ſay the queſtion *may* be anſwered in the affirmative, even if the Apoſtle Jude was a different perſon from Jude called the brother of Jeſus. But whether it ought, in this caſe, to be anſwered in the affirmative, is another matter: and I really believe, that it ought not. For, if the Jude, who wrote this Epiſtle, had been himſelf an Apoſtle, and brother of an Apoſtle, he would hardly have called himſelf, in an Epiſtle written to Chriſtians, ſimply 'Jude the brother of James' without adding the title Apoſtle. It is true, that the Apoſtle Jude, who was brother of James, is called by St. Luke ſimply Ιουδας Ιακωβου: but St. Luke gives him this title merely to diſtinguiſh him from another Apoſtle of this name, who was called Iſcariot. Now the author of this Epiſtle could have no motive for diſtinguiſhing himſelf from Judas Iſcariot, who had hanged himſelf many years before this Epiſtle was written. The name of Jude was very common among the Jews, and therefore the author of this Epiſtle wiſhed to diſtinguiſh

tinguiſh himſelf from other perſons, who were ſo called. But James was likewiſe a very common name; and therefore, if the author had been an Apoſtle, he ſurely would have preferred an appellation, which would have removed all doubt, to an appellation, which left it at leaſt uncertain, whether he was an Apoſtle or not. I grant, that the omiſſion of this title does not neceſſarily prove, that the author of our Epiſtle was not an Apoſtle: for St. Paul has omitted it in four of his Epiſtles*. But St. Paul was ſufficiently known without this title: whereas the author of the Epiſtle in queſtion felt the neceſſity of a diſtinguiſhing appellation, as appears from the very title, which he has given himſelf of 'brother of James.' Beſides, at the time, when this Epiſtle was written, only one Apoſtle, of the name of James, was then alive, for the elder James, the ſon of Zebedee, had been beheaded many years before. If then the author of our Epiſtle had only given to his brother James the title of Apoſtle, he would thus likewiſe have clearly aſcertained who he himſelf was. But, ſince he has no more given to his brother, than to himſelf, the title of Apoſtle, I think it highly probable, that neither of them were Apoſtles.

The next queſtion to be aſked therefore is, Was the Jude, who wrote our Epiſtle, the ſame perſon, as the Jude, whom the Evangeliſts call brother of Jeſus, and who, according to the opinion, which I think the moſt defenſible[a], was in this ſenſe 'brother of Jeſus,' that he was ſon of Joſeph by a former wife, and therefore not own brother, but only brother in law of Jeſus. Now that our Epiſtle was written by a perſon of this deſcription, appears to me highly probable. And on this ſuppoſition we may aſſign the reaſon, why the author called himſelf 'brother of James:' for if he was the brother in law of Jeſus, his brother James was the perſon,

* In the Epiſtle to the Philippians, in both Epiſtles to the Theſſalonians, and in that to Philemon.

[a] See Ch. xxvi. Sect. 1.

perſon, who during ſo many years had preſided over the church at Jeruſalem, was well known both to Jews and to Chriſtians, and appears to have been more celebrated than either of the Apoſtles, who were called James. It will be objected perhaps, that the very ſame reaſons, which I have alleged, to ſhew that an Apoſtle, of the name of Jude, would have aſſumed his proper title, will likewiſe ſhew that a perſon, who was called brother of Jeſus, would have done the ſame, and have ſtyled himſelf Jude the brother of Jeſus. To this I anſwer, that if he was the ſon of Joſeph, not by Mary, but by a former wife, and Jude believed in the immaculate conception, he muſt have been ſenſible, that, though to all outward appearance he was brother in law of Jeſus, ſince his own father was the huſband of Jeſus's mother, yet in reality he was no relation of Jeſus. On the other hand, if Jude, called the brother of Jeſus, was the ſon of Joſeph, not by a former wife, but by Mary, as Herder aſſerts, I do not ſee how the preceding objection can be anſwered. For, if Jeſus and Jude had the ſame mother, Jude might, without the leaſt impropriety, have ſtyled himſelf 'brother of Jeſus,' or 'brother of the Lord:' and this would have been a much more remarkable and diſtinguiſhing title, than that of 'brother of James.'

A third queſtion ſtill remains to be aſked on this ſubject. The Apoſtle, whom St. Luke calls Jude, is called Thaddæus by St. Matthew and St. Mark, as I have already obſerved. But the Apoſtle of the Syrians, who firſt preached the Goſpel at Edeſſa, and founded a church there, was named Thaddæus or Adæus. It may be aſked therefore, whether the author of our Epiſtle was Thaddæus the Apoſtle of the Syrians, though indeed it is not very probable that he was, ſince this Epiſtle is not in in the old Syriac verſion.

Euſebius[b] relates, that the inhabitants of the city of Edeſſa were converted to Chriſtianity by a diſciple named Thaddæus, who went thither immediately after Chriſt's

[b] Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. I. c. 13.

Chriſt's aſcenſion. It is true, that in the account, which Euſebius has given of the converſion of the Syrians, there are ſeveral circumſtances, ſuch as the correſpondence of king Abgarus with Chriſt, and others of a like nature, which are probably fabulous. But the principal fact, that Thaddæus preached the Goſpel at Edeſſa, and converted the Syrians to Chriſtianity ſoon after the aſcenſion, will hardly admit of a doubt, ſince the Syrian writers themſelves are unanimous in the aſſertion, that Thaddæus was their Apoſtle[c]. They call him in general Adai[d] (ܐܕܝ), and relate, that he came to Edeſſa ſoon after the aſcenſion, healed king Abgarus of the leproſy, converted him to Chriſtianity, and founded a church. From Edeſſa he went into Aſſyria, where he likewiſe preached the Goſpel; he then returned to Edeſſa, and died there in the twelfth year of his preaching, that is, in the twelfth year after the aſcenſion. In reſpect to the manner of his death, Syrian authors are not agreed. Some ſay, that he died a natural death, while Abgarus was ſtill living; but others relate, that he ſuffered martyrdom under Maanus, who, though ſon and ſucceſſor of Abgarus[e], was not, like his father, a convert to Chriſtianity. But whatever death he died, the city of Edeſſa has always claimed the honour of his burial place.

Moſt Syrian writers, as well as Euſebius, reckon this Thaddæus, or Adæus, as the Syrians call him, not as one of the twelve Apoſtles, but as one of the ſeventy diſciples. But according to Jerom, he was the Apoſtle Thaddæus[f], conſequently the Apoſtle, whom St. Luke calls

[c] See Aſſemani Bibl. Orient. T. I. p. 317—319. T. II. p. 391—394. Tom. III. P. i. p. 299. 302. 306. T. III. P. ii. p. 4—15. and Bayer's Hiſtoria Oſrhoëna et Edeſſena, p. 104—120.

[d] The reaſon, why they omit the ת at the beginning, may be ſeen in my Syriac Grammar.

[e] Maanus ſucceeded Abgarus, in the month of March, A. C. 45.

[f] In his Commentary on Matth. x. Tom. IV. p. 37. he ſays, Thaddæum apoſtolum eccleſiaſtica tradit hiſtoria miſſum Edeſſam ad Abgarum regem Oſrhoënæ.

calls Jude the brother of James: and Aſſeman[g] quotes Jeſujabas, who lived indeed ſo late as the twelfth century, and therefore is of no great authority, in favour of the ſame opinion. Jacob, biſhop of Sarug, who was born in the year 452, deſcribes Adæus, as brother of Chriſt: for in a work, which he has written 'on the Apoſtle Adæus, and king Abgarus,' he expreſſes himſelf thus, 'After the ever-bleſſed bridegroom was exalted to heaven, he reſolved, as he had promiſed, to ſend, out of love, ſome one to Abgarus, and he choſe for that purpoſe Adai, one of his brothers[h].' Now if the Apoſtle Jude, the brother of James, is the ſame, as the Jude, who was called brother of Chriſt, the word Apoſtle, as uſed by Jacob, biſhop of Sarug, muſt be taken in its proper ſenſe: but if the Apoſtle Jude, and Jude called the brother of Chriſt, were different perſons, or, at leaſt, if Jacob conſidered them as ſuch, the title Apoſtle applied by him to Adæus, muſt denote, not one of the twelve, but ſimply an Apoſtle, or converter of the Syrians.

According to ſome Syrian writers, two perſons of the name of Thaddæus were employed in their converſion, the one an Apoſtle, the other one of the ſeventy diſciples. The latter, they ſay, was ſent by the Apoſtle Thomas to king Abgarus, immediately after Chriſt's aſcenſion: but the former, according to their accounts, went ſome years later to Edeſſa, whence he travelled into Aſſyria, and thence returned into Phœnicia, in which country he died a martyr, either at Baruth, or at Arad, for on this head they are not agreed[i]. This Apoſtle Thaddæus they generally[k] call, not the brother, but

[g] Bibl. Orient. Tom. III. P. i. p. 299. 302.

[h] Aſſemani Bibl. Orient. Tom. I. p. 318.

[i] Aſſemani Bibl. Orient. Tom. III. P. ii. p. 13—15.

[k] But not univerſally, for according to Haſſencamp, p. 43, 44. ſome Syrian writers call him 'Jude the brother of James, who was brother of the Lord.'

but the ſon of James, (ܝܥܩܘܒ ܕܒܪ), a miſtake, which aroſe from a falſe interpretation of the words Ιουδας Ιακωβου: and this very miſtake has been made in the Syriac verſion, for in both places where this title occurs, namely, Luke vi. 16. Acts i. 13. it is rendered 'Jude the ſon of James[l].' Now this miſtake in the Syriac verſion could not have taken place, if the Syriac tranſlator had ever ſeen the Epiſtle of St. Jude, in which the author expreſsly calls himſelf 'brother of James.' But this Epiſtle is not contained in the old verſion, and conſequently it was unknown to the tranſlator[m].

From theſe contradictory and uncertain accounts of the Syrians we can form little or no judgement, in reſpect to the author of our Epiſtle. Adai (ܐܕܝ), who was the firſt Apoſtle of the Syrians, and one of the ſeventy diſciples, could not be the author; for he died in the twelfth year after the aſcenſion, whereas our Epiſtle was written, as will appear from a following ſection, after the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, and therefore long after the death of Adai. Nor do we know, whether this Adai, the firſt Apoſtle of the Syrians, was alſo called Jude, as well as the other Adai their ſecond Apoſtle: unleſs it be ſaid, that Adai, Thaddai, Juda, are one and the ſame name differently pronounced. And, what is the moſt deciſive, the old Syriac verſion does not contain this Epiſtle. Conſequently,

[l] However in the Arabic verſion publiſhed by Erpenius, it is properly rendered in the latter place by 'Jude the brother of James.' (يهود اخو يعقوب).

[m] Even without having ſeen the Epiſtle of St. Jude, one might ſuppoſe, that the old Syriac tranſlator, who lived in ſo very early an age, could hardly have made a miſtake in reſpect to the Apoſtle, whom St. Luke calls Ιουδας Ιακωβου, eſpecially as this very Jude, or Thaddæus, as St. Matthew and St. Mark call him, was ſo inſtrumental in the converſion of the Syrians, who muſt have known therefore, whether he was brother, or ſon of James. I wiſh that they, who have acceſs to MSS. of the Syriac verſion, would examine, whether in ſome of them Ιουδας Ιακωβου, Luke vi. 16. Acts i. 13. is not differently rendered.

quently, it is highly probable, that Adai, or Adæus, was not the author: for an Epiſtle, written by the great Apoſtle of the Syrians, would ſurely have been received into the canon of the Syrian church.

SECT. II.

Of the perſons to whom, and of the time when, this Epiſtle was written: and whether the author of it had read the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter.

I AM really unable to determine, who the perſons were, to whom this Epiſtle was ſent. For no traces are to be diſcovered in it, which enable us to form the leaſt judgement on this ſubject: and the addreſs, with which the Epiſtle commences, is ſo indeterminate, that there is hardly any Chriſtian community, where Greek was ſpoken, which might not be denoted by it. Though this Epiſtle has a very great ſimilarity to the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, it cannot have been ſent to the ſame perſons, namely, the Chriſtians, who reſided in Pontus, Cappadocia, &c. becauſe no mention is made of them in this Epiſtle. Nor can it have been ſent to the Chriſtians of Syria and Aſſyria, where St. Jude preached the Goſpel, if he is the ſame perſon as the Apoſtle of the Syrians: for in this caſe, the Epiſtle would not have been written in Greek, but in Syriac or Chaldee, and would certainly have been received into the old Syriac verſion.

With reſpect to the date of this Epiſtle, all that I am able to aſſert is, that it was written after the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter. But how many years after, whether between 64 and 66, as Lardner ſuppoſes, or between 70 and 75, as Beauſobre and L'Enfant believe,

or, according to Dodwell and Cave, in 71 or 72, or ſo late as the year 90, which is the opinion of Mill, I confeſs, that I am unable to determine, at leaſt from any certain data. The expreſſion 'in the laſt time,' which occurs, ver. 18. as well as in 2 Pet. iii. 3. is too indeterminate to warrant any concluſion reſpecting the date of this Epiſtle. For, though on the one hand, it may refer to the approaching deſtruction of Jeruſalem, it may, on the other hand, refer to a later period, and denote the cloſe of the Apoſtolic age: for in the firſt Epiſtle of St. John a ſimilar expreſſion occurs, which muſt be taken in this latter ſenſe. The inference therefore, that the Epiſtle of St. Jude was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, which ſome commentators have deduced from the above-mentioned expreſſion, on the ſuppoſition, that it alluded to that event then approaching, is very precarious, becauſe it is drawn from premiſes, which are themſelves uncertain. However there is ſome reaſon to believe, on other grounds, that this Epiſtle was not written after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. For as the author has mentioned, ver. 5—8. ſeveral well-known inſtances of God's juſtice, in puniſhing ſinners, which St. Peter had already quoted in his ſecond Epiſtle to the ſame purpoſe, he would probably, if Jeruſalem had been already deſtroyed, at the time when he wrote, have not neglected to add to his other examples this moſt remarkable inſtance of divine vengeance, eſpecially as Chriſt himſelf had foretold it.

I ſaid in the preceding paragraph, that the Epiſtle of St. Jude was written after the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter. This appears from a compariſon of the two Epiſtles, which are ſo ſimilar to each other both in ſentiments and in expreſſions, as no two Epiſtles could well be, unleſs the author of the one had read the Epiſtle of the other. It is evident therefore, that St. Jude borrowed from St. Peter both expreſſions and arguments, to which he himſelf has made ſome few additions,

additions. Lardner[n] indeed, though he admits the ſimilarity of the two Epiſtles, ſtill thinks it a matter of doubt, whether St. Jude had ever ſeen the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter. Lardner's reaſon is, 'that if St. Jude had formed a deſign of writing, and had met with an Epiſtle of one of the Apoſtles, very ſuitable to his own thoughts and intentions, he would have forborne to write.' To this argument I anſwer:

1. If the Epiſtle of St. Jude was inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, as Lardner admits, the Holy Ghoſt certainly knew, while he was dictating the Epiſtle to St. Jude, that an Epiſtle of St. Peter, of a like import, already exiſted. And if the Holy Ghoſt, notwithſtanding this knowledge, ſtill thought, that an Epiſtle of St. Jude was not unneceſſary, why ſhall we ſuppoſe, that St. Jude himſelf would have been prevented from writing by the ſame knowledge.

On the other hand, if the Epiſtle of St. Jude is not genuine, but is a forgery in his name, there is no improbability in the ſuppoſition, that the author derived his materials from an Epiſtle of St. Peter, in the ſame manner, as the perſon, who forged the Epiſtle to the Laodiceans in the name of St. Paul, copied from Apoſtolic writings.

2. The ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter was addreſſed to the inhabitants of ſome particular countries: but the addreſs of St. Jude's Epiſtle is general. St. Jude therefore might think it neceſſary to repeat for general uſe, what St. Peter had written only to certain communities.

3. The Epiſtle of St. Jude is not a bare copy of the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter: for in the former, not only ſeveral thoughts are more completely unravelled than in the latter, but ſeveral additions are made to what St. Peter had ſaid, for inſtance in ver. 4, 5. 9—16.

[n] Supplement, Vol. III. p. 35.

SECT. III.

Of the canonical authority of this Epistle: and first of the external evidence in its favour.

EUSEBIUS in his Catalogue of the books of the New Testament[o] places the Epistle of St. Jude among the αντιλεγομενα, in company with the Epistle of St. James, the second Epistle of St. Peter, and the second and third of St. John.

But Origen, who lived in the third century, though he speaks in dubious terms of the second Epistle of St. Peter, has several times quoted the Epistle of St. Jude, and has spoken of it as an Epistle, on which he entertained no doubt. In his Commentary on St. Matthew, when he comes to Ch. xiii. 55. where James, Joses, Simon, and Jude, are mentioned, he says, 'Jude wrote an Epistle, of few lines indeed, but full of the powerful words of the heavenly grace, who, at the beginning says, "Jude the servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James[p]." This is a very clear and unequivocal declaration of Origen's opinion[q]: and it is the more remarkable, because he says nothing of the Epistle of St. James, though the passage Matth. xiii. 55. afforded him as good an opportunity of speaking of this Epistle, as it did of the Epistle of St. Jude. Nay, Origen carries his veneration for the Epistle of St. Jude so far, that in his treatise De principiis, Lib. III. cap. 2. he quotes an apocryphal book called, The Assumption of Moses,

[o] Hist. Eccles. Lib. III. c. 25.

[p] Ιȣδας εγραψεν επιστολην, ολιγοστιχον μεν, πεπληρωμενην δε των της ȣρανιȣ χαριτος ερρωμενων λογων, ὁστις εν τῳ προοιμιῳ ειρηκεν· Ιȣδας, Ιησȣ Χριστȣ δȣλος, αδελφος δε Ιακωβȣ.

[q] Other quotations from Origen, of a like import, may be seen in Lardner's Supplement, Vol. III. p. 332, 333. and in his Credibility, P. II. Vol. III. Ch. xxviii.

Moſes, as a work of authority, becauſe a paſſage from this book had been quoted by St. Jude. In one inſtance however, in his Commentary on St. Matthew; Origen ſpeaks in leſs poſitive terms, for he there ſays; 'If any one receive the Epiſtle of St. Jude[r], &c.'

Tertullian, in whoſe works Lardner could diſcover no quotation from the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, deſcribes the Epiſtle of St Jude as the work of an Apoſtle: for in his treatiſe De cultu feminarum, c. 3. he ſays, 'Hence it is, that Enoch is quoted by the Apoſtle Jude.'

Clement of Alexandria, in whoſe works likewiſe Lardner could find no quotation from the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, has three times quoted the Epiſtle of St. Jude[s], without expreſſing any doubt whatſoever.

It appears then, that the three ancient fathers, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen, as far as we may judge from their writings, which are now extant, preferred the Epiſtle of St. Jude to the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter. However I think it not impoſſible, that, if all the writings of theſe authors were now extant, paſſages might be found in them, which would turn the ſcale in favour of the latter: and it may be owing to mere accident, that in thoſe parts of their works, which have deſcended to us, more paſſages, in which they ſpeak decidedly of the Epiſtle of St. Jude, are to be found, than ſuch as are favourable to the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter. For I really cannot comprehend how any impartial man, who has to chooſe between theſe two Epiſtles, which are very ſimilar to each other, can prefer the former to the latter, or receive the Epiſtle of St. Jude, the contents of which labour under great difficulties, and at the ſame time conſider as dubious, or even reject, the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, the contents of which labour under no ſuch

[r] Ει δε και την Ιουδα προσοιτο τις επιστολην.

[s] See Lardner's Supplement, Vol. III. p. 326—328.

ſuch difficulties. Whoever acts in this manner muſt have ſome prejudice againſt one or more of the doctrines delivered in the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter. Now that Origen, and likewiſe his preceptor Clement, had ſuch a prejudice, I will endeavour to ſhew in the following paragraph [t].

One of St. Peter's doctrines, in his ſecond Epiſtle, ch. iii. was, that the world would be finally deſtroyed. This is abſolutely denied by Philo, in his treatiſe de incorruptibilitate mundi: and I think, that Origen, who was an Alexandrine writer, as well as Philo, entertained the ſame notions. At leaſt, what he has written [u] on Matth. xxiv. 29, 30. amounts to this, that the violent diſſolution of the world, there deſcribed, is a matter replete with difficulty, and to be left to the faith of the weak and the unphiloſophical. In his treatiſe De principiis, Lib. I. cap. 6. where we might expect to find his real ſentiments in reſpect to a day of judgement and a diſſolution of the world, he cautiouſly avoids the giving of any deciſive opinion on this ſubject, and ſays, that he argues only, and does not determine [w]. That the world will undergo a change [x], he admits without reſerve, though not, that it will be totally annihilated, for which indeed no rational man will contend. But the manner, in which this change is to take place, is that, which he leaves undetermined, and

[t] What I am now going to ſay, I ſubmit to the deciſion of thoſe, who are better acquainted with the works of Origen than myſelf: and I ſhall be ready to retract my opinion, as ſoon as paſſages ſhall be produced, which ſhew, that my ſuſpicions are without foundation.

[u] Commentariorum ſeries in Matthæum, Sect. 48, 49. Tom. III. p. 865, 866. ed. Benedict.

[w] Quæ quidem a nobis cum magno metu et cautela dicentur, diſcutientibus magis ac pertractantibus, quam pro certo ac definito ſtatuentibus. Indicatum namque a nobis in ſuperioribus eſt, quæ ſint, de quibus manifeſto dogmate terminandum ſit:—nunc autem diſputandi ſpecie, magis quem definiendi, prout poſſumus, exercemus, Sect. 1. Tom. I. p. 69.

[x] Immutationem qualitatis, et habitus transformationem, Sect. 4.

and he has taken no notice in the whole chapter of the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, in which it is ſaid, that this change will be effected by fire. He uſes indeed the expreſſion 'a new heaven and a new earth' which occurs in this Epiſtle, but he quotes it from Iſaiah, and not from St. Peter[y]. Though Origen does not poſitively deny a general conflagration, he does not poſitively grant it: and it is obvious, that the new heaven and the new earth, of which he ſpeaks, might denote, in his opinion, nothing more than an improvement of their preſent ſtate, and not a totally new world, which ſhould riſe out of the ruins of the old. Origen's principles therefore appear to differ from the doctrine delivered by St. Peter on this ſubject in his ſecond Epiſtle: and this is probably the reaſon, why he eſteemed this Epiſtle leſs than the Epiſtle of St. Jude. One of them he thought it neceſſary to retain, becauſe theſe are the only two Epiſtles, in which the hiſtory of the rebellious angels is recorded, and this hiſtory was at that time of very great importance.

After the time of Euſebius, the Epiſtle of St. Jude was received both by the Greek and by the Latin church: but it does not enter into my plan, to appeal to the deciſion of councils, or to the ſentiments of eccleſiaſtical writers, who lived in the fifth and following centuries.

The ancient Syrian church did not receive it: at leaſt it has no place in the old Syriac verſion, any more than the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, and the two laſt Epiſtles of St. John. What later Syrian writers have thought of it, I know not: nor has Haſſencamp in his Remarks on the firſt edition of this Introduction been able to produce paſſages from Syrian authors, as decidedly in favour of this Epiſtle, as he has done in favour of the other Epiſtles, which are not contained in the old Syriac verſion.

[y] Eſaias quoque, cum per prophetiam dixit, 'quia erit cœlum novum, et terra nova,' ſimilem ſuggerit intellectum.

SECT. IV.

The ſame queſtion examined from internal evidence.

IT appears from the preceding ſection, that the external evidence is more in favour of this Epiſtle than againſt it: but if we examine its contents, we ſhall find, that there is leſs reaſon to believe it to be a work of divine authority, than Origen ſuppoſed. However not every objection, which has been made to it, is unanſwerable.

The very firſt objection, for inſtance, which is made to ver. 6, 7. may be eaſily removed.[y] It has been ſaid, that in the expreſſion ὁμοιον τουτοις τροπον, ver. 7. the pronoun τουτοις refers to αγγελους, ver. 6. Now if this were true, the author of our Epiſtle would ſay, that Sodom and Gomorrha, and other neighbouring cities, committed fornication, in the ſame manner as the fallen angels, and would thus appear to relate, as a real fact, the fable of the angels committing fornication with the daughters of men. But there is no neceſſity for referring τουτοις to αγγελους, ſince it may be referred, without violating the grammatical conſtruction, to Σοδομα, which is a neuter plural, and had been uſed at the beginning of ver. 7. Or it may relate to the falſe teachers, mentioned in the next verſe, whom the author of this Epiſtle expreſsly compares with the inhabitants of Sodom, on account of their licentious behaviour.

But it is much more difficult to vindicate the ninth verſe, in which the Archangel Michael is ſaid to have diſputed with the devil about the body of Moſes. The whole hiſtory of this diſpute, which has the appearance of a Jewiſh fable[z], it is not very eaſy at preſent

[z] Herder, in his Eſſay on the two Epiſtles of St. James and St. Jude, p. 81, 82. aſſerts, that this ſtory was derived by St. Jude, not from

ſent to diſcover, becauſe the book, from which it is ſuppoſed to have been taken by the author of our Epiſtle, is no longer extant: but I will here put together ſuch ſcattered accounts of it, as I have been able to collect.

Origen found in a Jewiſh Greek book, called the 'Aſſumption of Moſes[a],' which was extant in his time, though it is now loſt, this very ſtory related concerning the diſpute of the Archangel Michael with the devil about the body of Moſes. And from a compariſon of the relation in this book with St. Jude's quotation, he was thoroughly perſuaded, that it was the book, from which St. Jude quoted. This he aſſerts without the leaſt heſitation: and in conſequence of this perſuaſion he himſelf has quoted the Aſſumption of Moſes, as a work of authority, in proof of the temptation of Adam and Eve by the devil[b]. But as he has quoted it merely for this purpoſe, he has given us only an imperfect account of what this book contained, relative to the diſpute about the body of Moſes. One circumſtance however he has mentioned, which is not found in the Epiſtle of St. Jude, namely, that Michael reproached the devil with having poſſeſſed the ſerpent, which ſeduced Eve. In what manner this circumſtance is connected with the diſpute about the body of Moſes will appear from the following conſideration. The Jews imagined, the perſon of Moſes was ſo holy, that God could find no reaſon for permitting him to die: and that nothing, but the ſin committed by Adam

from a Jewiſh legend but from a Zoroaſtric doctrine in the Zend-Aveſta. 'Now whether the paſſage, which Herder, who every where diſcovers Zoroaſtric doctrines, has quoted from the Zend-Aveſta, or the well-known Jewiſh legend, is beſt adapted to the place in queſtion, I think no man will long heſitate in determining. But even if Herder's opinion were true, no advantage could accrue from it to the Epiſtle of St, Jude: for what he has quoted from the Zend-Aveſta is certainly a fable, nor can he himſelf ſuppoſe it to be otherwiſe.

[a] Ἀναλήψις τȣ Μωσεως.

[b] De principiis, Lib. III. cap. 2. 'Et primo quidem in geneſi ſerpens Evam ſeduxiſſe deſcribitur, de quo in Aſcenſione Moſis, cujus libelli meminit in Epiſtola ſua Apoſtolus Judas: Michael archangelus, cum diabolo diſputans de corpore Moyſi, ait, a diabolo inſpiratum ſerpentem cauſſam extitiſſe prævaricationis Adæ et Evæ.'

Adam and Eve in paradiſe, which brought death into the world, was the cauſe, why Moſes did not live for ever. The ſame notions they entertained of ſome other very holy perſons, for inſtance, of Iſai, who, they ſay, was delivered to the angel of death merely on account of the ſins of our firſt parents, though he himſelf did not deſerve to die. Now in the diſpute between Michael and the devil about Moſes, the devil was the accuſer, and demanded the death of Moſes. Michael therefore replied to him, that he himſelf was the cauſe of that ſin, which alone could occaſion the death of Moſes.—How very little ſuch notions, as theſe, agree either with the Chriſtian theology, or with Moſes's own writings, it is unneceſſary for me to declare.

Lardner[c] indeed contends that Origen was miſtaken in his aſſertion, that St. Jude quoted from a book called the Aſſumption of Moſes, and ſays, there is reaſon to believe, though this book exiſted in the time of Origen, that it was not written till after the time of St. Jude. But Lardner aſſigns no reaſon for this aſſertion; and ſince he himſelf never ſaw the book, and therefore could form no judgement of it, I think it very extraordinary, that he ſhould venture to contradict ſuch an eminent critic as Origen, who had actually ſeen it, and who lived within two hundred years after the time of St. Jude. If the Aſſumption of Moſes had not been written before the ſecond century, the age in which Origen's preceptor, Clement of Alexandria lived, it is wholly incredible that Origen, whoſe particular talent was criticiſm, ſhould have ſuffered himſelf to be ſo impoſed upon, in reſpect to the time of its compoſition, as to imagine that St. Jude quoted it in the firſt century.

Nor is Lardner the only perſon who aſſerts, that St. Jude did not quote from the Aſſumption of Moſes, for ſeveral other writers, in order to remove the reproach of a quotation from an apocryphal book, have maintained that this very book, inſtead of having been quoted by St. Jude, was a later forgery of ſome Chriſtian, and that the

[c] Supplement, Vol. III. p. 344.

the paſſage in St. Jude's Epiſtle relative to Michael and the devil gave riſe to the fabrication. Now this is a mere conjecture: and it is a very improbable one, becauſe we know that ſimilar, though not the ſame accounts, relative to a converſation of Michael and the devil at the death of Moſes, are contained likewiſe in Hebrew writings of the Jews. But no one can ſuppoſe that the Jews would fabricate a work, out of compliment to an Epiſtle written by a Chriſtian author.

Beſide the account given by Origen, there is a paſſage in the works of Oecumenius, which likewiſe contains a part of the ſtory related in the Aſſumption of Moſes, and which explains the reaſon of the diſpute, which St. Jude has mentioned concerning Moſes's body. According to this paſſage, Michael was employed in burying Moſes; but, the devil endeavoured to prevent it, by ſaying that he had murdered an Egyptian, and was therefore unworthy of an honourable burial [d]. Hence it appears, that ſome modern writers are miſtaken, who have imagined, that in the ancient narrative, the diſpute was ſaid to have ariſen from an attempt of the devil to reveal to the Jews the burial place of Moſes, and to incite them to an idolatrous worſhip of his body.

There is ſtill extant a Jewiſh book, written, in Hebrew, and entitled פטירת משה, that is, 'The death of Moſes,' which ſome critics, eſpecially De la Rue [e], ſuppoſe to be the ſame work, as that which Origen ſaw in Greek. Now if it were, this Hebrew book, entitled Phetirath Moſhe, would throw a great light on our preſent inquiry: but I have carefully examined it, and can

[d] The words of Oecumenius, Tom. II. p. 629, are, Ἡ δε περι τε Μωυσεως σωματος κρισις εστιν αὐτη· λεγεται τον Μιχαηλ τον αρχαγγελον τη τε Μωυσεως ταφη διεκονικεναι. Τε δε διαβολε τετο μη καταδεχομενε αλλ' επιφεροντος εγκλημα δια τον τε Αιγυπτιε φονον, ὡς δια τετο ανοχε οντος Μωυσεως, και μη συγχωρεισθαι ενεχειν τῆς εντιμε ταφῆς. A more full account of this fable is contained in a Greek ſcholion on Jude 9. in the Codex Lambecii 34. of which a tranſcript may be ſeen in the Orient. Bib. Vol. XXIII. p. 153.

[e] See his note on the above-quoted paſſage in Origen de principiis, Lib. III. c. 2.

can aſſert, that it is a modern work, and that its contents are not the ſame as thoſe of the Greek book quoted by Origen.

Of the Phetirath Moſhe we have two editions, which contain very different texts[f]. The one was printed at Conſtantinople in 1518, and reprinted at Venice in 1544 and 1605. The other was publiſhed from a manuſcript by Gilbert Gaulmyn, who added a tranſlation of both texts, with notes[g]. This is the edition which I have uſed, and for which I am indebted to Profeſſor Reimarus in Hamburg.

Though the two texts are in many reſpects different, they are ſtill texts of the ſame work, and their difference aroſe merely from the liberties taken by tranſcribers, who have acted here, as they have done in regard to other Jewiſh legends, and have made alterations and additions in the copies, which they wrote, with as much freedom as the author himſelf had uſed in the original compoſition. Both texts agree in the main with the book called Debarim Rabba, which is likewiſe a fabulous narrative of the death and burial of Moſes. But this Hebrew book, Phetirath Moſhe, is not the ſame as the Greek book, Ἀναλήψις τȣ̃ Μωσέως, which Origen read, and which he ſays was quoted by St. Jude: much leſs is the latter a tranſlation of the former. The Phetirath Moſhe was undoubtedly written in a later age: for it contains frequent quotations from the Talmud, and in p. 109, even Abeneſra is quoted[h]. And the ſtory which

[f] They are deſcribed in Wolfii Bibliotheca Rabbinica, Tom. II. p. 1278, 1279, 1394.

[g] The title of this edition is רעה דברי הימים ופטירתו של משה, De vita et morte Moſis, libri tres. Gilbertus Gaulmyn, Molinenſis, ex MSS. exemplaribus primus Hebraice edidit, Latina interpretatione et notis illuſtravit. Pariſiis, apud Tuſſanum du Bray, via Jacobæa, ſub ſpicis maturis, 1629.

[h] It is therefore extraordinary that Gaulmyn, the editor of this book, ſhould expreſs a doubt whether it were ancient or modern. He ſays, p. 375, Edimus, neſcio an illos (libros) prorſus, quos ante Chriſtum Judaicæ plebi cognitiſſimos ſcimus. Certe, ut eſt traditionum ſuarum gens pertinaciſſima, omnino, ſi hiſtoriam ſpectes, eoſdem habes: quod plenius oſtendemus in diatriba de apocryphis Hebræorum libris.

which it contains, though probably an ancient one, is not the ſame, as that which is contained in the Αναληψις τυ Μωσεως: for ſeveral material circumſtances quoted by Origen and Oecumenius from the latter, are not mentioned in the former. In the Phetirath Moſhe for inſtance,

1. The devil, who is there called Samael, does not diſpute about the burial of Moſes.

2. Michael does not reproach the devil with having poſſeſſed the ſerpent, which ſeduced Eve.

3. Michael does not ſay to him, 'The Lord rebuke thee.'

4. But he himſelf rebukes the devil, and calls him רשע, that is, thou wicked wretch. And Moſes ſays the ſame to the devil, when he comes by God's command to fetch his ſoul.—This is the very reverſe of that which St. Jude relates concerning the diſpute of Michael with the devil.

The ſubſtance of the ſtory related in this book, as far as concerns the preſent inquiry, is as follows.

Moſes requeſts of God under various pretences, either that he may not die at all, or at leaſt that he may not die before he comes into Paleſtine. This requeſt he makes in ſo froward and petulant a manner, as is highly unbecoming not only a great prophet, but even any man, who has expectations of a better life after this. In ſhort Moſes is here repreſented in the light of a deſpicable Jew, begging for a continuance of life, and devoid both of Chriſtian faith, and of heathen courage: and it is therefore not improbable, that the inventor of this fable made himſelf the model, after which he formed the character of Moſes. God argues, on the contrary, with great patience and forbearance, and replies to what Moſes had alleged relative to the merit of his own good works. Further, it is God, who ſays to Moſes, that he muſt die on account of the ſin of Adam: to which Moſes anſwers, that he ought to be excepted, becauſe he was ſuperior in merit to Adam, Abraham, Iſaac, &c. In the mean time, Samael, that is, the angel of death, whom

whom the Jews deſcribe as the chief of the devils, rejoices at the approaching death of Moſes. This is obſerved by Michael, who ſays to him, 'Thou wicked wretch, I grieve, and thou laugheſt.' Moſes, after his requeſt had been repeatedly refuſed, invokes heaven and earth, and all creatures around him, to intercede in his behalf. Joſhua attempts to pray for him: but the devil ſtops Joſhua's mouth, and repreſents to him, really in ſcripture ſtyle, the impropriety of ſuch a prayer. The elders of the people, and with them all the children of Iſrael then offer to intercede for Moſes: but their mouths are likewiſe ſtopped by a million eight hundred and forty thouſand devils, which on a moderate calculation, make three devils to one man. After this, God commands the angel Gabriel, to fetch the ſoul of Moſes: but Gabriel excuſes himſelf, ſaying that Moſes was too ſtrong for him. Michael receives the ſame order, and excuſes himſelf in the ſame manner, or, as other accounts ſay, under pretence that he had been the inſtructor of Moſes, and therefore could not bear to ſee him die. But this laſt excuſe, according to the Phetirath Moſhe, was made by Zinghiel, the third angel, who received this command. Samael, that is, the devil, then offers his ſervices; but God aſks him, how he would take hold of Moſes, whether by his Mouth, or by his hands, or by his feet, ſaying that every part of Moſes was too holy for him to touch. The devil however inſiſts on bringing the ſoul of Moſes: yet he does not accuſe him, for, on the contrary, he prizes him higher than Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob. The devil then approaches towards Moſes to execute this voluntary commiſſion: but, as ſoon as he ſees the ſhining countenance of Moſes, he is ſeized with a violent pain, like that of a woman in labour. Moſes, inſtead of uſing the oriental ſalutation, 'Peace be with thee,' ſays to him in the words of Iſaiah, ch. lvii. 21. (for in this work Moſes frequently quotes Iſaiah and the Pſalms), 'There is no peace to the wicked.' The devil replies, that he was come by the order of God, to fetch his ſoul: but Moſes deters him from the attempt by

repreſenting his own ſtrength and holineſs: and ſaying, 'Go thou wicked wretch, I will not give thee my ſoul,' he affrights the devil in ſuch a manner that he immediately retires. The devil then returns to God, and relates what had paſſed: and receives an order to go a ſecond time. The devil anſwers, that he would go every where God commanded him, even into hell, and into fire, but not to Moſes. This remonſtrance however is of no avail, and he is obliged to go back again. But Moſes, who ſees him coming with a drawn ſword, meets him with his miraculous rod, and gives him ſo ſevere a blow with it, that the devil is glad to eſcape. Laſtly, God himſelf comes: and Moſes, having then no further hopes, requeſts only that his ſoul may not be taken out of his body by the devil. This requeſt is granted him. Zinghiel, Gabriel, and Michael then lay him on a bed: and the ſoul of Moſes begins to diſpute with God, and objects to its being taken out of a body, which was ſo pure and holy, that no fly dared to ſettle on it. But God kiſſes Moſes, and with a kiſs extracts his ſoul from his body. Upon this, God utters a heavy lamentation: and thus the ſtory in the Phetirath Moſhe ends, without any mention of a diſpute about the burial of Moſes's body. This laſt ſcene therefore, which was contained in the Greek book ſeen by Origen, is wanting in the Hebrew. But in both of theſe works, Michael, as well as the devil, expreſſes the ſame ſentiments in reſpect to Moſes: in both works the ſame ſpirit prevails: and the concluding ſcene which was contained in the Greek book, is nothing more than a continuation of the ſame ſtory, which is contained in the Hebrew.

After what I have reported in the preceding paragraph, I ſeriouſly aſk every impartial judge, whether that perſon could be an inſpired writer, or an immediate diſciple of him, who made a manifeſt diſtinction between the hiſtory of the Old Teſtament and the fabulous traditions of the Jews, who has quoted ſuch a book as that, which I have juſt deſcribed, and ſelected from it a paſſage ſo ap-

parently fabulous. Various attempts have been made to remove this difficulty, but with very little ſucceſs.

Origen removed it in the ſhorteſt way by pronouncing the 'Aſſumption of Moſes' a work of authority, and by quoting this book in proof of the opinion, that the ſerpent, who ſeduced Eve, was poſſeſſed by the devil. But the example of Origen, who could eaſily explain away its abſurdities by the aid of his allegorical interpretation, will hardly induce any modern critic to receive as divine a book not contained in the Hebrew canon, for which, and for which alone, we have the atteſtation of Chriſt.

Some other commentators ſay, that a quotation from an apocryphal book no more proves that St. Jude, who quoted it, believed it was a divine work, than St. Paul's quotations from Greek poets, or from the apocryphal books of Jannes and Jambres, from which he has taken the names of the Egyptian magicians, 2 Tim. iii. 8. But this argument is not in point: for the quotation in the Epiſtle of St. Jude is of a very different kind from thoſe in the Epiſtles of St. Paul, not excepting that which he has made in 2 Tim. iii. 8. That Egyptian magicians oppoſed themſelves to Moſes we know from the account which Moſes himſelf has given in the book of Exodus: and though their names are not recorded by him, the remembrance of them might have been preſerved by the Jews through other means. That two of them were called Jannes and Jambres is a matter not incredible: and not only various Jewiſh writers ſpeak of them, but likewiſe Numenius. The mention therefore of their names by St. Paul, even though his knowledge of them was derived from a book, which was not canonical, is nothing extraordinary; for that two of the Egyptian magicians, who endeavoured to counteract Moſes, were called Jannes and Jambres, is a matter, which may be credited on mere human teſtimony. But the converſation of Michael with the devil, which is quoted in the Epiſtle of St. Jude, is a fact of a very different

different kind: for it lies without the circle of human experience, and therefore it cannot be atteſted by any man, unleſs he has either divine inſpiration, or has intercourſe with beings of a ſuperior order. Conſequently, whoever was the author of the apocryphal book, from which the quotation was made, his account cannot poſſibly command aſſent. Even if Jannes and Jambres were not the real names of two Egyptian ſorcerers, but were invented by the Jews of later ages, ſtill St. Paul might have uſed the names, by which they were known in his time, in the ſame manner as we call the Greek verſion made at Alexandria by the name of Septuagint, though we do not believe in the fable of the ſeventy interpreters. No man could ſay that I acted with impropriety, if in converſation with Arabians I called Alexander the Great by the name of Dulcarnain, though that title was not given him till after his death. But if I quoted the travels of Moſes, or the fall of the devil, as they are related in the Koran, and quoted them not only as facts, in which I believed, but as facts on which theological doctrines might be grounded, it is not probable that any man would aſſent to my argumentation.

Other commentators endeavour to remove the difficulty by ſaying that St. Jude took his account perhaps, not from the Greek book quoted by Origen, but from ſome authentic Hebrew book which is now loſt, or from ſome reſpectable and credible tradition of the Jews. But the difficulty is to make it even probable, that any ſuch authentic Hebrew book, or any ſuch credible tradition exiſted in the firſt century. At that time the Jews had no other books, beſide thoſe contained in the Bible, which were antecedent to the Babyloniſh captivity: and mere oral tradition, relative to a fact ſuppoſed to have happened ſo many hundred years before the captivity, no rational man will conſider as credible. If therefore St. Jude, inſtead of quoting a Greek book called the Aſſumption of Moſes, had quoted a Hebrew book, in which the ſame ſtory was related, ſtill that Hebrew book would have been no better authority, than

the Greek. The language can make no difference in this caſe: and, unleſs we grant with Origen, that the Αναλημψις τȣ Μωσεως was canonical, we cannot ſuppoſe, that a Hebrew book with this title was written by a prophet. But if it was not written by a prophet, or by a man who had ſupernatural information, we cannot give him credit for a relation of what is ſaid and done in the region of ſpirits, eſpecially when that relation ſo ſtrongly favours of fable, and ſo ill agrees with the laſt chapter of Deuteronomy.

Finally, it is ſaid, that in the apocryphal writings, and in the oral tradition of the Jews, ſome true accounts were intermixed with the fabulous, and hence it is inferred that St. Jude, by the aid of divine inſpiration, might have known, that the ſtory of the diſpute, between Michael and the devil about Moſes, was a pearl which lay buried in an heap of rubbiſh. Now that the Jewiſh fables were intermixed with ſome true facts, and that a writer, if he has divine inſpiration, will diſtinguiſh them from the fabulous parts, no one will deny. But the difficulty is to make this principle apply to the preſent caſe. The diſpute, between Michael and the devil about the body of Moſes, has by no means the appearance of a true hiſtory: and the author of our Epiſtle has not even hinted that he knew it to be true by the aid of divine inſpiration, or that he diſtinguiſhed it from other Jewiſh traditions. On the contrary, he has introduced it as part of a ſtory, with which his readers were already acquainted; he does not appear to have had any other authority for it, than they themſelves had: nor does the part, which he has quoted, at all imply, either that he himſelf doubted, or that he wiſhed his readers ſhould doubt, of the other parts of it.

The truth of theſe arguments has been perceived by more than one commentator on the Epiſtle of St. Jude. In order therefore, to remove at once all objections to a quotation from an apocryphal book, they have given to Jude 9, a myſtical interpretation; and by thus diſtorting its meaning have endeavoured to ſhew, that the quota-

tion was taken from a part of the Old Teſtament. According to their explanation the 'body of Moſes' denotes the whole Jewiſh nation, in the ſame manner as the whole aſſemblage of Chriſtians is ſometimes called the body of Chriſt: and Jude 9, is nothing more than an illuſion to the viſion, in the third chapter of Zechariah, in which they ſay the whole Jewiſh nation is accuſed before the Lord in the perſon of Joſhua, the high prieſt. And Vitringa, on the ſuppoſition, that St. Jude really alluded to this viſion, propoſes to alter the body of Moſes to the body of Joſhua, and inſtead of περι τε Μωσεως σωματος to read περι τε Ιησε σωματος; that the paſſage may be better adapted to the viſion of Zechariah, and that the harſh expreſſion 'body of Moſes,' in the ſenſe of 'Jewiſh nation,' may be avoided. Now a conjecture, which is ſupported by no authority, and is adopted merely to ſupport a previouſly aſſumed hypotheſis, would be entitled to no credit, even if it ſuited the context, and involved no difficulty. But in the preſent inſtance the propoſed alteration is to me at leaſt unintelligible; for in the third chapter of Zechariah, Joſhua appears indeed before the angel of the Lord, but no mention is made of a diſpute about his body. Setting aſide therefore this arbitrary and forced alteration, which is not generally adopted by the defenders of a myſtical interpretation of Jude 9, I will ſtate the objections which may be made to their opinion, that St. Jude alluded to the viſion of Zechariah.

1. In the whole of this viſion there is nothing, which has the leaſt ſimilarity to Jude 9, except the expreſſion, 'The Lord rebuke thee.' The name of Michael is not once mentioned in it; the unnamed angel, who appears in it, is not one of the diſputants, but the judge: and the perſon, whom the devil reſiſts, is Joſhua.

2. There is nothing in this viſion, which is at all ſuitable to the purpoſe, for which St. Jude has quoted the diſpute of Michael, as an example of modeſty, and as a proof of his doctrine, that one ought not to ſpeak evil of dignities, but leave judgement to the Lord. Now

in the viſion of Zechariah, ſince the unnamed angel is repreſented, not as one of the contending parties, but as judge, this modeſty would be very ill placed; for a judge muſt either decide without reſpect to perſons, or not decide at all. And if by the unnamed angel, in the viſion of Zechariah, is meant the uncreated angel, or the Son of God, as is generally, and not without reaſon, ſuppoſed, diffidence in judgement is ſtill leſs ſuitable to his character. For if the Son of God ventured not to pronounce judgement on the devil, but left it to the Father, there muſt be an eſſential difference between the Godhead of the Father, and the Godhead of the Son. Whoever therefore explains Jude 9, as having reference to the viſion in Zechariah, undermines, though without being aware of it, the doctrine of Chriſt's divinity. But I do not think that the Epiſtle of St. Jude deſerves to be vindicated at the expence of a doctrine, which is clearly revealed in the Bible.

3. The explanation of the 'body of Moſes' as a myſtical appellation of the children of Iſrael, and that too in a paſſage, where the context does not lead to any ſuch interpretation is hardly admiſſible: and I cannot ſuppoſe that if St. Jude had meant the children of Iſrael, he would have denoted them by ſo harſh a figurative expreſſion as that of the 'body of Moſes.' That the Chriſtian church is ſometimes called from the head and founder of our religion, who ſtill lives and protects us, the body of Chriſt, eſpecially in thoſe paſſages, in which the connexion explains the meaning of this figure, is no reaſon why the Jewiſh nation ſhould be called the body of Moſes, in a place where no mention had been made of the Iſraelites, and at a time when Moſes was long dead, and had ceaſed to be their head and protector. Nor is there any thing in the third chapter of Zechariah, to which St. Jude is ſuppoſed to allude, which could give riſe to ſuch a figurative expreſſion; for the name of Moſes is not once mentioned in it.

4. As the Jews had undoubtedly a tradition that Michael and the devil diſputed at the death of Moſes, and

and the ſtory was related in the Greek book, which Origen ſaw, it is very difficult to give any other than a literal interpretation to the words σωμα Μωσεως in the Epiſtle of St. Jude, or to ſhew that he did not allude to the well-known Jewiſh tradition.

Some other commentators, who interpret σωμα Μωσεως figuratively, explain it as denoting the five books of Moſes, and contend that the diſpute, of which St. Jude ſpeaks, is the diſpute of Chriſt with the devil, at the time of his temptation in the wilderneſs. Now the ſecond and fourth of the objections, which I made to the preceding interpretation may be equally applied to this: and alſo the three following objections may be made to it in particular.

1. In the temptation of Chriſt by the devil, no diſpute ariſes about the books of Moſes. It is true that Chriſt quotes two paſſages from the Pentateuch, as the devil quotes from the Pſalms: but a quotation from a book cannot be conſidered as a diſpute about (περι) it, that is, as a diſpute about its authority.

2. Michael cannot denote Chriſt, for Michael is the name of a created angel. But, even if Michael be interpreted, though there is no ground for any ſuch interpretation[1], of the uncreated angel, or the Son of God, it is ſtill an improper appellation of Chriſt, when regard is had to his human nature. And, whatever explanation the word Michael may admit, it is hardly credible that St. Jude, if he had really meant Jeſus Chriſt, would have called him by any other, than his real and proper name. At any rate he would not have given him a name, which belonged to another being.

3. The expreſſion 'The Lord rebuke thee,' which St. Jude quotes, does not occur in the hiſtory of Chriſt's temptation.

After

[1] They who appeal to the compoſition of the Hebrew word Michael, which ſignifies, 'Who is like God,' and thence argue, that it is a very proper title for him, who is equal to God, are not aware that this very name is given in the Old Teſtament to ſeveral men, and therefore does not admit of the application, which they have made of it. See Simonis Onomaſticon Vet. Teſt. p. 504. where ten different perſons are mentioned, who bore the name of Michael.

After all then, we muſt conclude with Origen, that St. Jude derived his account of the diſpute between Michael and the devil about the body of Moſes, from an apocryphal book. And I know no other method of vindicating the quotation, than by ſuppoſing that St. Jude conſidered the whole ſtory, not as a real fact, which either he himſelf believed, or which he required his readers to believe, but merely as an inſtructive fable, which ſerved to illuſtrate the doctrine, which he himſelf inculcated, namely, that we ought not to ſpeak evil of dignities. With this view he might quote from the Aſſumption of Moſes the converſation of Michael, as an example of diffidence worthy of imitation, without intending to aſſert that the ſtory was true, or that the book from which he quoted was of divine authority. This is the only vindication, of which in my opinion St. Jude's quotation is capable: but whether it be a ſatisfactory one, I leave to be determined by the reader.

To the doctrine, which St. Jude inculcates by this quotation, that we ought not to ſpeak evil of dignities, not even of the fallen angels, but that we ſhould leave judgment to God, I have no objection. And I really think, that they tranſgreſs the bounds of propriety, who make it their buſineſs either in the pulpit or in their writings, to repreſent the devil as an object of deteſtation, ſince, notwithſtanding his fall, he is ſtill a being of a ſuperior order. This reminds me of a certain Oriental ſect, which Niebuhr met with in the neighbourhood of the river Zab in Aſſyria, and which for the ſame reaſon as that, which I have juſt aſſigned, will not ſuffer any one to ſpeak evil of the devil. It is ſaid that many of this ſect are to be found alſo in ſeveral places on this ſide of the Tigris, eſpecially on mount Singar. Whether they are Chriſtians, or Jews, or Mohammedans is uncertain. They call themſelves Jeſideans[k], and Dauaſin[l]; and relate that the founder of their ſect was a very holy perſon, named Shaich Ade. Now, as Addus, the Apoſtle

[k] يزيد

[l] Perhaps from دواسين prudentes.

Apoſtle of the Syrians, preached the Goſpel in thoſe very countries, in which the Jeſideans reſide, and Adæus has been ſuppoſed by ſome critics to have been the author of our Epiſtle, curioſity is naturally excited to know ſomething more of this ſect[m], eſpecially whether they maintain other unuſual doctrines, which are delivered in this Epiſtle.

Laſtly, beſide the quotation, which St. Jude has made in the 9th verſe, relative to the diſpute between Michael and the devil, he has another quotation ver. 14, 15. likewiſe from an apocryphal book, called the 'Prophecies of Enoch,' or, if not from any written work, from oral tradition. Now, ſhould it be granted that Enoch was a prophet, though it is not certain that he was, yet as none of his prophecies are recorded in the Old Teſtament, no one could poſſibly know what they were. It is manifeſt therefore that the book, called 'The Prophecies of Enoch,' was a mere Jewiſh forgery, and that too a very unfortunate one, ſince in all human probability the uſe of letters was unknown in the time of Enoch, and conſequently he could not have left behind him any written prophecies. It is true that an inſpired writer might have known through the medium of divine information, what Enoch had propheſied, without having recourſe to any written work on this ſubject. But St. Jude, in the place where he ſpeaks of Enoch's prophecies, does not ſpeak of them as prophecies which had been made known to him by a particular revelation; on the contrary, he ſpeaks of them in ſuch a manner, as implies that his readers were already acquainted with them. Lardner has taken great pains to vindicate this quotation of St. Jude: and as I am unable to ſay more in its defence than he has done, I muſt refer the reader to what he has ſaid in his Supplement to the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, Vol. III. p. 338—343.

[m] What is related of them in Niebuhr's Travels, Vol. II. p. 344—348. deſerves particularly to be examined, though it did not occur to Niebuhr to compare their tenets with the Epiſtle of St. Jude.

SECT. V.

Reſult of the inquiry inſtituted in the preceding ſections; and the queſtion in debate brought to a final iſſue.

FROM the account, which has been already given, it appears, that we have very little reaſon for placing the Epiſtle of St. Jude among the ſacred writings. If the ancient church had decided poſitively in its favour, this deciſion would not convince me that the Epiſtle of St. Jude was inſpired[n]: but the ancient church is ſo divided on this ſubject, that whoever is guided by it muſt at leaſt ſuſpect, or rather reject the Epiſtle of St. Jude. And if we are directed in our judgement by the contents of the Epiſtle, we ſhall have ſtill no inducement to believe that it is a ſacred and divine work.

But before the queſtion in debate can be brought to a final iſſue, we muſt return to the inquiry inſtituted in the firſt ſection of this chapter, relative to the perſon and character of the author. If the Jude, who wrote this Epiſtle, was the Apoſtle Jude, the brother of the younger Apoſtle James, we muſt place it without further heſitation among the Apoſtolic writings, and pronounce it canonical. And in this caſe, we muſt either believe in the ſtory of the diſpute between Michael and the devil, and in the prophecies of Enoch, or admit that the arguments, which have been alleged againſt the two quotations in the Epiſtle of St. Jude, affect the infallibility of the Apoſtles themſelves. On the other hand, if the author of this Epiſtle was not Jude, the Apoſtle, but Jude the brother in law of Jeſus, I can ſee no reaſon why we ſhould account it canonical, ſince the brethren of Jeſus not only were not Apoſtles, but did not even believe in him during his life time. That St. James, another

[n] See what was ſaid on the teſtimony of the ancient church to the inſpiration of a book of the New Teſtament, in the firſt Volume of this Introduction, ch. iii. ſect. 2.

another of Chriſt's brethren became afterwards one of the pillars of the church, and was placed on a level with the Apoſtles, will not warrant us to conclude the ſame of his brother Jude, of whom we know nothing more than, that he was a ſon of Joſeph by a former wife. But this relationſhip alone is no argument that he was inſpired, and is no reaſon why his Epiſtle, which contains accounts apparently fabulous, and which was ſuſpected by the ancient church, ſhould be received as a rule of faith and manners.

I cannot therefore acknowledge that this Epiſtle is canonical. And I have really ſome doubts whether it be not even a forgery, made in the name of Jude, by ſome perſon, who borrowed the chief part of his materials from the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, and added ſome few of his own.

CHAP. XXX.

OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN.

SECT. I.

Of the time, when this Epiſtle was written[o].

IT is difficult to determine the preciſe year, when this Epiſtle was written, becauſe our hiſtorical accounts are defective on this ſubject, and the Epiſtle itſelf contains nothing, which can lead to ſo exact a determination. Some commentators have aſcribed to it ſo late a date, as 91, 92, 98, or 99: and Lardner, though he admits that

[o] I do not enter into any inquiry concerning its authenticity, becauſe it has been univerſally admitted from the earlieſt ages; and the ſtyle of it is manifeſtly the ſtyle of St. John.

that the exact date is not known, is still of opinion, that it was written after the destruction of Jerusalem. The reason, which he gives for this opinion is, 'that the arguments alleged, for proving it to have been written sooner, are not satisfactory[p].' Now, if I admit that these premises are true, still the inference, which Lardner deduces from them, will not be valid: for we must not argue that, because a demonstration is unsatisfactory, the proposition itself is false. The only admissible conclusion therefore from these premises would be, that it is uncertain, whether the Epistle was written before, or after the destruction of Jerusalem. Lardner indeed adds, 'perhaps some things may occur, affording hints of a later date: but till these things are pointed out, no argument can be grounded on them.'

That several of the reasons alleged in favour of the opinion, that this Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, are not so convincing, when closely examined, as they appear to be at first sight, I will not deny. Grotius appeals to ch. ii. 18. where St. John says, ἐσχατη ὡρα ἐστι, by which Grotius understands the last hour of the existence of the Jewish nation. It is true that ἐσχατη ὡρα cannot denote the last hour of the existence of the world, which has continued to exist seventeen hundred years after this Epistle was written: and it is likewise true that some other explanations of ἐσχατη ὡρα are attended with great difficulty; for instance, that which is given by Morus, who interprets it of the fourth Monarchy, or the Roman empire, in which the Antichrist was to come. Now it is hardly credible that St. John alluded in this passage to the prophecy of Daniel, and thence borrowed his computation of time. In the whole New Testament I know of no clear and indisputable passage, in which the Roman empire is called 'the last time:' and in the present instance this expression surely cannot denote the Roman empire, because St. John says, that the coming of the Antichrists was a token of this 'last time.' Every one knew, that the

[p] Supplement, Vol. III. p. 270.

the Roman empire, or Daniel's fourth monarchy then exiſted: and therefore St. John could have no need to point out to his readers any token of its arrival. The interpretation would be more ſpecious, if St. John had been ſpeaking of ſuch heretics, as were predeceſſors of the Pope of Rome: of the Eſſenes, for inſtance, from whom, according to St. Paul, the great apoſtacy was to take its riſe, and who are ſtill conſidered as ſaints by the Romiſh Church. But St. John ſpeaks of Heretics, who are condemned by the perſon called the Roman Antichriſt, and whoſe errors are foreign to his. Nor is Wolf's explanation more ſatisfactory, who ſays, that εσχατη ὡρα is equivalent to the Hebrew אחרית הימים, 'the end of the days,' and that this expreſſion in the Hebrew Bible denotes the period of the New Covenant. For though ſome Jews apply this expreſſion to the time of the Meſſiah, the application is wholly arbitrary, ſince it denotes, not a particular, but any future period, as appears from the uſe of it in Gen. xlix. 1. Jerem. xlviii. 47. xlix. 39. And yet I hardly think, that the interpretation of Grotius is right: for the laſt hour of the exiſtence of Jeruſalem was a matter, which did not immediately concern the greateſt part of St. John's readers, who were probably heathen converts, ſince the Gnoſtic errors, which St. John combats, prevailed chiefly among the heathen converts, and not among the converts from Judaiſm, who were infected with Ebionite errors. Nor do I ſee how St. John could argue from the many Antichriſts, by which he means Gnoſtics, to the approaching deſtruction of Jeruſalem. For, though Chriſt himſelf had foretold, Matth. xxiv. 24. that many falſe Chriſts would appear, previous to that event, yet he underſtood impoſtors, who would aſſume to themſelves the character of a Meſſiah, whereas St. John's Antichriſts were falſe teachers in the Chriſtian Church, and probably Gnoſtic adverſaries of the Apoſtles.

Perhaps therefore it is moſt adviſeable to interpret 'the laſt hour,' 1 John ii. 18. as well as 'the laſt days,' 2 Pet. iii. 3. in which St. Peter ſays, that ſcoffers will

will come, of the laſt days of the Apoſtles, or of the latter part of the Apoſtolic age. The Apoſtles probably foreſaw that the Church would not remain undiſturbed, but that in their latter days falſe teachers would ariſe, whom they have ſometimes called Antichriſts, becauſe falſe teachers in fact oppoſe Chriſt. But if we adopt this explanation, the inference, which Grotius deduced from the paſſage, ch. ii. 18, namely, that the Epiſtle was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, will ceaſe to be valid. For the latter part of the Apoſtolic age, though it may be conſidered as commencing before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, eſpecially if it be true, that St. Peter meant it in the above-quoted paſſage, laſted as long as St. John lived: and therefore the expreſſion uſed by St. John in the place to which appeal is made, leaves it undetermined, whether he wrote before or after Jeruſalem was deſtroyed.

Yet, though Grotius's argument does not appear to be valid, I ſtill think, for another reaſon, that the opinion itſelf is highly probable, and that the Epiſtle was really written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. St. John's Goſpel was oppoſed to heretics, who maintained the ſame tenets with thoſe, who are oppoſed in this Epiſtle. In the Goſpel he has confuted them by argument: in the Epiſtle he expreſſes only his diſapprobation of them. I conclude therefore, that this Epiſtle was written before his Goſpel; for if he had already given a complete confutation, when he wrote this Epiſtle, he would have thought it unneceſſary to have again declared the falſity.

SECT. II.

Of the persons, to whom this Epistle was written.

THIS question is still more difficult to decide, than the preceding. In the Latin version it was formerly called the Epistle of St. John to the Parthians: and this title was adopted by some of the ancient fathers, and in modern times has been defended by Grotius. But if St. John had intended this Epistle for the use of the Parthians, he would hardly have written it in Greek, but would have used either the language of the country, or, if he was unacquainted with it, would have written at least in Syriac, which was the language of the learned in the Parthian empire, and especially of the Christians. We know from the history of Manes, that even the learned in that country were, for the most part, unacquainted with the Greek language: for to Manes, though he united literature with genius, his adversaries objected, that he understood only the barbarous Syriac. And that a Greek book would not have been understood in the Parthian empire, appears likewise from what Josephus says in the Preface to his history of the Jewish war, § 2, where he declares, that a work intended for the Parthian Jews, must be written, not in Greek, but in Hebrew. However, it is worth while to examine, whence the superscription 'ad Parthos' took its rise. Whiston conjectures that an ancient Greek superscription of this Epistle was προς παρθενας, because the Epistle is chiefly addressed to uncorrupted Christians, that this title was falsely copied προς παρθας, whence was derived the Latin superscription 'ad Parthos.' But this conjecture is without foundation: for since the faithful are not called in a single instance throughout the whole Epistle by the name of παρθενας, it is very improbable that the title προς παρθενας was ever affixed to it. I would rather suppose therefore, that the frequent use in this Epistle of

of the words 'Light' and 'Darkneſs,' terms, which occur in the Perſian philoſophy, and on the ſame occaſions, as thoſe, on which St. John has uſed them, gave riſe to the opinion, that St. John wrote it with a view of correcting the abuſes of the Perſian philoſophy: whence it was inferred that he deſigned it for the uſe of the Chriſtians in the Parthian empire. And that St. John really deſigned his Epiſtle as a warning to thoſe Chriſtians who were in danger of being infected with Zoroaſtrian principles, is very probable[q]: though the language of the Epiſtle will not permit us to place St. John's readers in a country to the eaſt of the Euphrates.

Lightfoot ſuppoſes that the Epiſtle was written to the Corinthians: but he has not ſupported his opinion by any arguments. Benſon thinks, that it was ſent to the Chriſtians, who reſided in Galilee, a ſhort time before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem: but, as St. John, ch. v. 21. cautions his readers againſt idolatry[r], they hardly reſided in Galilee, where idolatry was not practiſed.

Lampe, who appeals to Theodoret, contends[s], that it was not deſigned for any particular community, but that it was written for the uſe of Chriſtians of every denomination. And this is really the moſt probable opinion, ſince the Epiſtle contains no reference to any individual church. The only difficulty attending this opinion lies in the name 'Epiſtle,' becauſe the frequent uſe, in an Epiſtle, of the terms Light and Darkneſs, taken in the Perſian ſenſe of theſe words, ſeems to imply that it was written to perſons of a particular deſcription. But if we call it a treatiſe, this difficulty will ceaſe: and in fact the name 'Epiſtle' is improperly applied to it, ſince it has nothing, which entitles it to this appellation.

It

[q] The Gnoſtics, againſt whom St. John wrote, probably made uſe of Zoroaſtrian terms, though their doctrines were not wholly the ſame as thoſe of the Zoroaſtrian philoſophy.

[r] In the following ſection I ſhall endeavour to ſhew that this paſſage applies to the Gnoſtics.

[s] Prol. in Evangel. Johannis, p. 105.

It does not begin with the ſalutation, which is uſed in Greek Epiſtles, and with which St. John himſelf begins his two laſt Epiſtles: nor does it contain any ſalutations, though they are found in almoſt all the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles. It is true that St. John addreſſes his readers in the ſecond perſon: but this mode of writing is frequently adopted in books, and eſpecially in prefaces. For inſtance in Wolf's Elements of Mathematics, the reader is addreſſed throughout in the ſecond perſon. I conſider therefore that, which is commonly called the firſt Epiſtle of St. John, as a book or treatiſe, in which the Apoſtle declared to the whole world his diſapprobation of the doctrines maintained by Cerinthus and the Gnoſtics. However, as I do not think it worth while to diſpute about words, I have retained the uſual title, and have called it the firſt Epiſtle of St. John.

SECT. III.

Of the contents, and deſign of this Epiſtle.

THAT the deſign of this Epiſtle was to combat the doctrine delivered by certain falſe teachers, appears from ch. ii. 18—26. iii. 7. iv. 1—3.: and what this falſe doctrine was, may be inferred from the counter-doctrine delivered by St. John, ch. v. 1—6. The Apoſtle here aſſerts that 'Jeſus is the Chriſt,' and that he was the Chriſt, 'not by water only, but by water and blood.' Now theſe words, which in themſelves are not very intelligible, become perfectly clear, if we conſider them as oppoſed to the doctrine of Cerinthus, who aſſerted that Jeſus was by birth a mere man; but that the Æon, Chriſt, deſcended on him at his baptiſm, and left him before his death. But if what St. John ſays, ch. v. 1—6. was oppoſed to Cerinthus, the Antichriſts

of whom he ſpeaks ch. ii. 18, 19, and who, according to ver. 22. denied that Jeſus was the Chriſt, as alſo the falſe prophets mentioned ch. iv. 1—3. muſt be Cerinthians or at leaſt Gnoſtics. That they were neither Jews, nor heathens, may be inferred from ch. ii. 19. where St. John ſays, 'they went out from *us*.' Further, he deſcribes them ch. ii. 18. as perſons, who had lately appeared in the world. But this deſcription ſuits neither Jews, nor heathens, who, when this Epiſtle was written, had not lately begun to deny, that Jeſus was the Chriſt. Laſtly, in the ſame verſe he deſcribes them as tokens of the laſt time, ſaying: 'as ye have heard that Antichriſt ſhall come, even now there are many Antichriſts, *whereby* we know that it is the laſt time. But this inference could not be drawn from the refuſal of the Jews, to acknowledge that Jeſus was the Meſſiah.

Now as ſoon as we perceive, that the poſition 'Jeſus is the Chriſt,' is a counterpoſition againſt Cerinthus, we may infer, as I have already obſerved, that the Antichriſts who denied that Jeſus was the Chriſt[t], or who denied that Chriſt had appeared in the fleſh, were Cerinthians: or perhaps the latter were Docetes. It is therefore highly probable, that the whole Epiſtle, which in various places diſcovers an oppoſition to falſe teachers, was written againſt Cerinthians, or at leaſt againſt Gnoſtics and Magi. A propoſition can never be completely underſtood, unleſs we know the author's deſign in delivering it. For inſtance, 'God is light, and in him is no darkneſs,' appears to contain a tautology, if we conſider it, as a detached dogma: and if it be conſidered as an admonitory propoſition, it may be thought to contain a ſevere reproof. But if we regard it in a polemical view, it will preſent itſelf under a very different form. This Epiſtle abounds with exhortations: but no man who wiſhes to underſtand it, will be ſatisfied, without aſking the following queſtions. Why did St. John give theſe admonitions? Why has he ſo frequently repeated them? Why has he admoniſhed, if he thought admonition

[t] Ch. ii. 22. iv. 23.

tion neceſſary, merely in general terms, to holineſs and brotherly love? And why has he not ſometimes deſcended to particulars, as other Apoſtles have done? An anſwer to theſe queſtions will throw great light on the Epiſtle; and this light I will endeavour to procure for the reader, by pointing out the ſeveral propoſitions, which, in my opinion, are laid down in oppoſition to Gnoſtic errors.

1. In the firſt chapter, the four firſt verſes are oppoſed to the following aſſertion of the Gnoſtics: 'that the Apoſtles did not deliver the doctrine of Jeſus, as they had received it, but made additions to it, eſpecially in the commandments, which were termed legal, whereas they themſelves (the Gnoſtics) retained the genuine and uncorrupted myſtery[u].' St. John therefore ſays, 'that he declared that, which was from the beginning, which he himſelf had ſeen and heard:' that is, that he taught the doctrine of Chriſt, as it was originally delivered, as he had heard it from Chriſt's own mouth, whoſe perſon he had ſeen and felt, and that he made no additions of his own, but only reported as a faithful witneſs. In like manner he appeals ch. ii. 13, 14. to the elder Chriſtians, whom he calls fathers, 'becauſe they knew him, that was from the beginning,' that is, becauſe they knew how Chriſt had taught from the beginning[w]: and ver. 24. he ſays, 'Let that abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning.' Further, he ſays, ch. ii. 7. 'Brethren, I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment, which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word, which ye have heard from the beginning.' In the next verſe, he adds, 'Again

[u] Dicentes, ſe, non ſolum preſbyteris, ſed et apoſtolis ſuperiores, ſinceram inveniſſe veritatem, apoſtolos autem admiſcuiſſe ea, quæ ſunt legalia ſalvatoris verba:—ſe incontaminate et ſincere abſconditum ſcire myſterium. Irenæus adv. Hæres. Lib. iii. c. 2.

[w] The expreſſion 'from the beginning' cannot denote 'the beginning of the world,' in reference to God's eternity, for St. John appeals only to old men, as knowing that, which was from the beginning: but God's eternity can no more be teſtified by the oldeſt man, than by the youngeſt child.

'Again a new commandment I write unto you, which thing is true in him and in you, becauſe the darkneſs is paſt, and the light now ſhineth.' Now Chriſt himſelf had given his diſciples a commandment, which he called a new commandment: and this was, 'that they ſhould love one another[x].' The term 'new commandment' St. John borrowed therefore from Chriſt: but in the preſent inſtance he appears to have applied it to a different ſubject, becauſe the ſpecial command, which Chriſt gave to his diſciples, that they ſhould love each other, and which he called a new commandment, could not be well called an old commandment, being very different from the general commandment, that we ſhould love our neighbour. St. John therefore probably meant that the commandment of love and ſanctification was no new commandment, as the Gnoſtics pretended, but was the old commandment of Chriſt, which the Chriſtians had heard from the beginning. It was indeed become a new commandment, in conſequence of the falſe doctrines, which then prevailed: or rather, it appeared to be ſo, becauſe the Gnoſtics had endeavoured to baniſh it from their ſyſtem of theology. But whether a new, or an old commandment, St. John thought proper to enforce it.

2. The Gnoſtics, who contended, that thoſe commandments, which were legal, were not given by Chriſt, but were added by the Apoſtles without his authority, counteracted by ſo doing, the whole doctrine of ſanctification. St. John therefore devotes the greateſt part of his Epiſtle to the confirmation and enforcement of this doctrine. In the firſt chapter, ver. 5—7. he aſſerts, as a principal part of the meſſage, which he had heard from Chriſt, that no one, who walks not in the light, has fellowſhip with God. In the three following verſes he limits this propoſition in ſuch a manner, as was neceſſary, in arguing with an adverſary: and ch. ii. 1. 2. he removes the objection, that, according to his doctrine, a Chriſtian, who was guilty of wilful ſins, loſt thereby

[x] John xiii. 34.

thereby all hopes of salvation. He then maintains, ver. 3—5. and apparently in allusion to the word γνωσις (knowledge), the favourite term of the Gnostics, that he who boasted of profound knowledge, and at the same time rejected the commandments of Christ, had not a real, but only a pretended knowledge: and that in him only the love of God is perfected (τετελειωται), who keeps God's word. The expression τετελειωται is a term, which was used in the schools of the philosophers, and applied to the scholars called esoterici, who had made a considerable progress in the inner school. Now the Gnostics were, in their opinion, scholars of this description: but since they, whose imaginary system of theology annuls the commands of God, are so far from being perfect, that they are not even beginners in the science, St. John very properly refuses to admit their pretensions, and opposes to them others, who were perfect in a different way, and who were more justly entitled to the appellation [y]. With respect to the expressions 'keeping the commandments of God,' or 'not keeping his commandments,' it must be observed, that, when used in a polemical work, they denote, not merely the observance or violation of God's commands in our own practice, but the teaching of others, that they are to be observed or rejected. What St. John says, ver. 7, 8. has been already explained in the preceding paragraph.

The whole of the third chapter, and a great part of the fourth, are devoted to the same doctrine of sanctification, on which I have to make the following remarks:

When St. John says, ch. iii. 7. 'Let no man deceive you, he who doeth righteousness, is righteous,' he probably intends, not merely to deliver a precept, but to oppose the doctrine of those, who asserted, that a man, though he sinned, might be righteous in respect to his spiritual soul, because sin proceeded only from the material

[y] If the explanation, which I have here given of 1 John ii. 3—5, had been properly considered, the Lutheran divines at the beginning of this century would not have been so divided about the passage, and would not have applied it in the controversy on the doctrine of regeneration, to which it has no reference.

terial body. A ſimilar obſervation may be applied to ver. 4. 'whoſoever committeth ſin, tranſgreſſeth alſo the law,' which, conſidered by itſelf, appears to be an identical propoſition, but, when conſidered as an aſſertion oppoſed to the Gnoſtics, it is far from being ſuperfluous, becauſe, evident as it appears to be, they virtually denied it. From the paſſage above-quoted from the works of Irenæus, we have ſeen that they rejected the legal commandments, as parts of the Chriſtian religion, which were not warranted by the authority of Chriſt: conſequently they denied, that ſin was a tranſgreſſion of the law. Further, it was conſiſtent with their principles, to regard ſins as diſeaſes: for they believed in a metempſychoſis, and imagined, that the ſouls of men were confined in their preſent bodies, as in a priſon, and as a puniſhment for having offended in the regions above. According to this ſyſtem, the violent and irregular paſſions of anger, hatred, luſt, &c. were tortures for the ſoul, they were diſeaſes, but not puniſhable tranſgreſſions of the law. I will not aſſert, that all, who believed in a tranſmigration of ſouls, argued in this manner: but ſome of them certainly did ſo, and againſt theſe it was not ſuperfluous to write, 'Whoſoever committeth ſin, tranſgreſſeth alſo the law, for ſin is the tranſgreſſion of the law.'

The love of the brethren, which St. John enforced as a chief commandment, is generally underſtood of that ſpecial love, which Chriſt commanded his diſciples to have toward each other[z]. But I rather think that St. John means the love of our neighbour in general, which Chriſt commanded, as comprehending the half of the law: for this general love St. John might very properly call the love of our brother, ſince God has created us all, and is our common father. Beſides, as St. John calls Cain, Abel's brother, ch. iii. 12. he could not intend to ſignify by this term a perſon of the ſame religious ſentiments. Nor would it have been conſiſtent with candour, to have cenſured the Gnoſtics, for not having

[z] John xiii. 34.

having Christian brotherly love toward St. John, and other true believers: for in this particular sense they were not brethren, and St. John himself in his second Epistle, ver. 10. forbids the exercise of Christian brotherly love toward those, who teach false doctrines. I believe therefore, that the brotherly love, of which St. John speaks in the third chapter of this Epistle, is not confined to that special love, which we owe to those who are allied to us by religion, but denotes the love of our neighbour in general. Nor do I except even the 16th verse, where some think that St. John would require too much, if he meant brotherly love in general, or charity toward all men. But are there not certain cases, in which it is our duty to hazard and even sacrifice our lives, in order to rescue our neighbour? Is not this duty performed by the soldier? And is it not performed by him, who visits those, that are infected with contagious diseases? It is true, that this is not a duty which every man owes in all cases to his neighbour: but then, on the other hand, is it not a duty, which every man owes in all cases to his spiritual brother? Nor was it St. John's design so much to enforce this duty, and to recommend the exercise of it, as to argue from the acknowledgement of this duty in certain cases, to the necessity of performing the less painful duty of supporting our brethren in distress by a participation of our temporal possessions. But though I believe, that in the third chapter St. John speaks of the love of our neighbour in general, I do not mean to affirm that, he no where understands that special love which Christians owe one to another, of which we meet with an instance in ch. v. 1. 2.

With respect to the moral conduct of the Gnostics, against whom St. John wrote, we may infer therefore, that the Apostle found more reason to censure them, for their want of charity toward their neighbour, than for dissoluteness or debauchery. This want of charity they probably displayed by a hatred of the true believers.

What St. John says, ch. v. 3. that God's commandments are not grievous,' appears in the clearest light,

when we conſider it as oppoſed to the Gnoſtics, to whom the divine commandments, as delivered by the Apoſtles, appeared to be too legal.

3. St. John declares, ch. i. 5. as the meſſage which he had heard from Chriſt, 'that God is light, and in him is no darkneſs at all.' Now, if this propoſition had then been as generally admitted, as it is at preſent, there could have been no neceſſity for declaring it at the very beginning of the Epiſtle, with ſo much energy, to be the grand meſſage of Chriſt. We may reaſonably infer therefore, that it was oppoſed to certain perſons, who delivered a contrary doctrine. Further, the words 'Light' and 'Darkneſs,' which are here applied to the Deity in a manner, which is not uſual in the Bible, remind us of the technical terms uſed by the Perſian Magi, and afterwards by the Manicheans. It is true, that in the Bible we meet with the expreſſions, 'works of the light,' 'children of the light,' 'to walk in the light,' and others of the ſame kind: but in theſe inſtances the term 'light' is not ſynonymous to 'holineſs,' works of the light denoting nothing more, than works, which no man need be aſhamed to perform openly, and in the face of the whole world. This explanation of the word 'light,' is inapplicable in the propoſition 'God is light,' becauſe there would be an impropriety in repreſenting God, either as fearing, or not fearing, to act in the face of the whole world. St. John therefore uſes the term 'light,' as equivalent to holineſs.

Now the Gnoſtics admitted that the Supreme Being was perfectly holy, and pure light[a]: but they denied that the Supreme Being was the God, whom the Jews and the Chriſtians worſhipped. For the Jews and the Chriſtians worſhipped the Creator of the world: and the Gnoſtics aſſerted that the Creator of the world was either a ſpirit of darkneſs, or, if he was a ſpirit of light, that he was not free from darkneſs.

From

[a] They appear however to have taken the word light in a literal and phyſical ſenſe.

From ch. ii. 23. where St. John says, that he who denies the son, rejects also the father, it appears that his adversaries did not deny the father in positive terms, since the Apostle argues only, that they virtually did so by denying the son. Now the Gnostics did not positively deny the father of Christ, whom they allowed to be the Supreme Being: but then they did not allow that he was the Creator. The terms therefore 'God,' and the 'Father of Christ,' though they denote in reality the same person, must not be considered as having precisely the same import: since the adversaries of St. John admitted, that the father of Christ was the Supreme Being, and pure light, but denied that the Creator, who is in fact God, was light without darkness.

4. In some places, especially ch. iv. 2. 3. St. John opposes false teachers of another description, namely, those who denied that Christ was come in the flesh. Now they, who denied this, were not Cerinthians, but another kind of Gnostics, called Docetes. For, as on the one hand Cerinthus maintained, that Jesus was a mere, and therefore real, man, the Docetes on the other hand contended that he was an incorporeal phantom, in which the Æon Christ, or the divine nature, presented itself to mankind. Ch. i. 1. 'our hands have handled,' appears likewise to be opposed to this error of the Docetes.

5. In ch. v. 1—6. the expressions 'Jesus the Christ,' and 'Jesus the son of God,' are manifestly used as synonymous. But in our systems of theology the word 'Christ' is used to denote the office of our Saviour, and the expression, 'son of God,' to denote his divine nature. Consequently we use one of these two expressions in a sense, which is different from that, in which it is here used by St. John. Some writers therefore, who have observed this, have proposed to alter the meaning, which we ascribe to the term 'son of God,' and to explain this term, as well as the word Christ, as equivalent to Messiah, and expressive of our Saviour's office. But in my opinion we shall be better able to explain the

Epistle

Epiſtle of St. John, if we take the term 'ſon of God' in its uſual ſenſe, and aſcribe to the word 'Chriſt' a meaning different from that, which it has in our theology. For the Gnoſtics, againſt whom St. John wrote, did not deny the divine nature and the divine miſſion of Jeſus: but they aſſerted, eſpecially Cerinthus, that Chriſt was the perſonal name of the Æon, or divine nature, which, according to their ſyſtem, accompanied Jeſus from the time of his baptiſm, and to which the voice from heaven, 'this is my beloved ſon,' related. When St. John therefore uſes the terms 'Son of God' and 'Chriſt,' as ſynonymous, it is evident that he does not take them in the Jewiſh ſenſe of theſe expreſſions, but in the ſenſe, in which his Gnoſtic adverſaries denied, that Jeſus was the Chriſt. In ſhort, I believe that the word Chriſt, as uſed by St. John, ch. v. 1—6. denotes, not our Saviour's office, but his divine nature. To confute the Gnoſtics it was neceſſary to argue with them in their own terms: but the word 'Chriſt' as uſed by the Gnoſtics, was not equivalent to the word Meſſiah, as uſed by the Jews, but denoted a divine nature, or, as they called it, an Æon.

6. St. John in ſeveral parts of this Epiſtle ſpeaks of perſons, whom he calls 'the world.' Now in modern ſermons this appellation is commonly uſed to denote thoſe, who in the language of our theology, are not regenerate. But we can hardly explain St. John's meaning from our preſent uſe of this term. It appears to me rather that St. John uſed it, to denote the adverſaries, againſt whom he wrote. For the Jews called the heathens in general the nations of the world[b]: and the Gnoſtics might not improperly be called heathens, ſince they brought a ſyſtem of heatheniſm into the church of Chriſt.

If this explanation be admitted, ch. iv. 4. may be paraphraſed in the following manner: 'God, who dwelleth among us, and ſheweth his power by the wonderful works,

[b] This expreſſion is uſed alſo in the New Teſtament, for inſtance, Luke xii. 30. to denote the heathens.

works, which are the ſeal of the Apoſtolic church, is greater than the God, who dwelleth among the Gnoſtics, and performeth no ſuch wonderful works.' According to this interpretation ὁ εν τῳ κοσμῳ ſignifies, not the devil, as is generally ſuppoſed, but the pretended ſupreme being of the Gnoſtics, who was in fact a non-entity. The next verſe likewiſe may be paraphraſed: 'They belong, not to the church, but to the heathens, for their doctrine is only an improved heatheniſm, and on that account the heathens liſten to them.' Again, ch. 4. 5. may be paraphraſed thus. 'Our victory over the heathens is our faith in the ſon of God. We triumph, not by force, and perſecution, or by the converſion of every unbeliever: but this is our triumph, that we have the true faith of the ſon of God.'

The explanation which I have here given of the word κοσμος, I do not mean to apply in every paſſage of this Epiſtle: for I confine it to thoſe places, in which St. John uſes it to denote his adverſaries.

7. The doctrines, which St. John has delivered in this Epiſtle, he has not ſupported, either by arguments drawn from reaſon, or by quotations from the Old Teſtament: for neither of them were neceſſary, ſince the bare aſſertion of an Apoſtle of Chriſt is ſufficient authority. It is true, that in one reſpect this Epiſtle has leſs energy than St. John's Goſpel: becauſe in his Goſpel he warrants his doctrines by the ſpeeches of Chriſt. But then, on the other hand, St. John declares in this Epiſtle, ch. iii. 24—iv. 4. v. 14—16. that God ſent his ſpirit to the Apoſtolic church, and heard their prayers. And it is evident that St. John alludes to the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, and to the miraculous powers obtained by prayer.

8. The cloſe of the Epiſtle, 'keep yourſelves from idols,' has no immediate connexion with the preceding diſcourſe. I am therefore in doubt, whether St. John meant to warn his readers againſt taking part in heathen ſacrifices, which was allowed by thoſe Gnoſtics, who are called

called Nicolaites in the Apocalypſe: or whether he meant to deſcribe the ſyſtem of the Gnoſtics in general, as a ſyſtem of idolatry, which in fact it was.

CHAP. XXXI.

DISSERTATION ON 1 JOHN V. 7.

SECT. I.

Previous remarks on this ſubject.

THE controverſy relative to 1 John v. 7. has rendered this paſſage ſo celebrated, and at the ſame time has rendered ſo much benefit to biblical criticiſm, by being the cauſe, that Greek manuſcripts, ancient verſions and editions, have been examined with greater accuracy, than they otherwiſe would have been, that the reader would hardly excuſe me, if I paſſed over this ſubject in total ſilence. But as this controverſy is ſo very extenſive, and the limits of the preſent work will not permit me to go over the whole ground, and examine every thing, which has been ſaid on both ſides of the queſtion, I ſhall argue chiefly from the premiſes, which the moſt learned, and likewiſe the moſt candid advocate of 1 John v. 7. has admitted, and proved. But though we agree in the premiſes, our concluſions are totally different.

In the year 1750, when I publiſhed the firſt edition of this Introduction, the opinion, that 1 John v. 7. was ſpurious, did not ſo generally prevail, as it does at preſent: and my defence of this opinion, though it belongs only

only to the province of the critic, did not fail to procure me enemies, who regarded me as a heretic, in ſpite of the moſt ſolemn proteſtations, that, though I believed the paſſage to be ſpurious, I did not doubt the doctrine contained in it, which may be proved, and in a much better manner, from other paſſages of the New Teſtament. That I may not appear to conceal the publications, which have been directed either wholly, or partly, againſt me, I will enumerate the ſeveral defences of 1 John v. 7. which have appeared ſince the period above-mentioned.

The firſt is a theſis written for a public diſputation by Dr. Semler at Halle in 1751, entitled, Vindiciæ plurium præcipuarum lectionum codicis Græci Novi Teſtamenti, adverſus Whiſtonum, atque ab eo latas leges criticas. This tract eminently diſtinguiſhes itſelf from the reſt by its profound learning, and great moderation. It would be ſuperfluous to make any reply to it at preſent, becauſe the learned author himſelf, who ſoon after altered his opinion, not only confuted all the arguments which had been uſed in favour of 1 John v. 7., but wrote the moſt important work, which we have on this ſubject.

The next defence of 1 John v. 7. was written by Mr. I. E. Wagner, in 1752, and entitled, Integritas commatis ſeptimi capitis quinti primæ Joannis epiſtolæ ab impugnationibus novatoris cujuſdam denuo vindicata. This treatiſe was directed particularly againſt me, whom the author meant by his 'novator quidam.' But with ſuch an adverſary as Mr. Wagner I never could perſuade myſelf to enter into any controverſy.

After a lapſe of above thirty years, the learned Knittel undertook another defence of the diſputed paſſage in his 'New Criticiſms on 1 John v. 7.' printed at Brunſwick, in 1785. This is a valuable work, and much uſeful information may be derived from it: but in the proof of the principal point the author has totally failed[c].'

In

[c] See my review of this work in the Neue Orientaliſche Bibliothek, No. 32.

In the ſame year Mr. Travis publiſhed in London his 'Letters to Gibbon:' and in the year following Mr. Streſow printed at Hamburgh his 'Open avowal of the doctrine of the Trinity as delivered in 1 John v. 7.' But both of theſe publications[d] betrayed the utmoſt partiality and ignorance.

I muſt now mention what has been written during the ſame interval on the other ſide of the queſtion, eſpecially ſince ſo many new authorities have been produced againſt the diſputed paſſage, that its ſpuriouſneſs is ſtill more ſtrongly confirmed, than it was fifty years ago.

In the firſt place muſt be mentioned Wetſtein's Note to 1 John v. 7. which contains a very copious diſſertation on this paſſage. In particular, he has quoted a much greater number of Greek manuſcripts than any former critic: and he was the firſt who produced the evidence of the Philoxenian Syriac verſion, from which it appeared that the paſſage was no more contained in this verſion, than in the old Syriac. Soon after the publication of Wetſtein's Greek Teſtament, ſeveral Letters appeared on this ſubject in the Journal Britannique[e], which diſcovered great learning and penetration, but were written, for the moſt part, in rather too ludicrous a tone for ſerious criticiſm. In theſe letters were particularly expoſed, the ridiculous and falſe pretence of Amelote, that the diſputed paſſage was contained in a Vatican manuſcript, and the abſurd inference which ſome perſons had deduced from Wetſtein's correction of an erratum relative to the three Lectionaries belonging to Ceſar de Miſſy, this correction having been converted into an acknowledgement, that the paſſage was contained in one of theſe three Lectionaries. The lateſt publication on this ſide of the queſtion is that of Dr. Semler, entitled, Hiſtorical and critical collections, relative to what

[d] Whoever wiſhes for further information about them may conſult what I have ſaid in the Orientaliſche Bibliothek.

[e] Tom. VIII. p. 194. 274. T. IX. p. 44. 290. T. X. 127. T. XI. 66. T. XV. p. 148. 151.

what are called the proof paſſages in dogmatic theology, Vol. I. on 1 John v. 7.' In this work the learned author has repreſented in ſo clear and comprehenſive a manner all that can be ſaid on both ſides, that every man, who reads it with impartiality, muſt perceive that the paſſage is no longer defenſible.

At preſent therefore it is unneceſſary to enter at large into this controverſy; and conſequently I ſhall do nothing more than attempt to convince thoſe readers, who have either not ſufficient leiſure or not ſufficient inclination to enter into deep critical inquiries, of the ſpuriouſneſs of 1 John v. 7., by arguing from the premiſes, which Bengel the moſt learned writer in its defence has granted and proved. At the ſame time, I ſhall ſubjoin in notes an account of ſuch authorities, as have been diſcovered ſince Bengel's time, in ſupport of his poſitions: and ſhall likewiſe add in a ſeparate ſection an additional argument againſt 1 John v. 7. which may be drawn from the hiſtory of the Alogi.

That the reader may clearly comprehend what is the ſubject of debate, which appears not to have been underſtood even by ſome of thoſe, who have engaged in the controverſy, I will here repreſent 1 John v. 7, 8. as the paſſage ſtands in our common printed editions, and incloſe in brackets thoſe words which are wanting in the Greek manuſcripts. Ὅτι τρεις εισιν οἱ μαρτυρουντες [εν τῳ ουρανῳ, ὁ πατηρ, ὁ λογος, και το ἁγιον πνευμα· και ουτοι οἱ τρεις ἑν εισι. Και τρεις εισιν οἱ μαρτυρουντες εν τῃ γῃ] το πνευμα, και το ὑδωρ, και το αἱμα· και οἱ τρεις εις το ἑν εισι. The words which are incloſed between brackets I maintain are ſpurious, and aſſert that this text, as it proceeded from the pen of St. John, ran thus. Ὅτι τρεις εισιν οἱ μαρτυρουντες, το πνευμα, και το ὑδωρ, και το αἱμα· και οἱ τρεις εις το ἑν εισι.

From this repreſentation it appears, that thoſe arguments are wholly ungrounded, which are drawn from the connexion between the 7th and 8th verſes. It has been objected namely,

1. That,

1. That, if the ſeventh verſe be omitted, the words εν τη γη in the eighth verſe have nothing, to which they can be oppoſed, that the antitheſis, between the earthly, and the heavenly witneſſes is deſtroyed, and conſequently that the context does not permit the omiſſion of the ſeventh verſe. Now this argument preſuppoſes, that the words εν τη γη are genuine, whereas they make a part of the controverted paſſage, and are themſelves as ſpurious as the words εν τω ουρανω.

2. That the eighth verſe begins with και, whence it is inferred, that beſide the witneſſes mentioned in this verſe, other witneſſes muſt have been mentioned immediately before. Now the ſame anſwer may be given to this argument as to the preceding, for και at the beginning of ver. 8. is again a part of the controverted paſſage. And if it were not, the argument would be of no value, ſince a conjunction copulative, as well as a cauſal conjunction, may connect the 8th verſe with the 6th, without any reference to other witneſſes. This is really the caſe in the old Syriac verſion, and in the Erpenian Arabic verſion, which was made from the Syriac. Theſe two verſions expreſs: 'The ſpirit beareth witneſs, for the ſpirit is truth: and there are three, that bear witneſs, the ſpirit, the water, and the blood.'

SECT. II.

Five charges againſt 1 *John* v. 7. *admitted by Bengel.*

I NOW deliver the charges againſt 1 John v. 7. which Bengel in his Apparatus criticus has not only admitted, but, where it was neceſſary, has proved. Now as Bengel was by far the moſt learned of thoſe who have defended the

the paſſage, and as he was likewiſe highly diſtinguiſhed both for his accuracy and his ſcrupulous conſcientiouſneſs, we may ſafely take for granted, that the charges are true, which this able and honeſt advocate has admitted. They are as follows.

1. Not a ſingle Greek manuſcript, written before the ſixteenth century [f], contains the controverted paſſage [g].

2. Though

[f] The Codex Montfortianus, which contains the paſſage, was written in England after the year 1500. As to the Codex Ravianus, which likewiſe contains the paſſage, it is a mere forgery, as the reader will find on conſulting my catalogue of MSS. in the ſecond volume of this Introduction, Ch. viii. Sect. 6. N°. 195. Further, the paſſage is contained in a Wolfenbüttel MS. called by Knittel in his 'New Criticiſms on 1 John v. 7.' Codex Guelpherbytanus D. But it is certain that this MS. was written ſo late as the laſt century. See my catalogue of MSS. N°. 131. Laſtly, there is another MS. in the ſame library, called by Knittel Guelpherbytanus C, (N°. 130. in my catalogue), in which the paſſage is found, not in the text, but in the margin, and written, not by the perſon who wrote the manuſcript, but in a very different, and in a very modern hand. However this MS. has an unuſual reading in the text; for inſtead of ὅτι τρεις εισιν οἱ μαρτυρουντες, το πνευμα, κ.τ.λ. it has ὅτι οἱ τρεις εισιν οἱ μαρτύρουντες, το πνευμα, κ.τ.λ. whence Knittel conjectures, but, as far I can ſee without the leaſt foundation, that 1 John v. 7. was contained in the text of the more ancient manuſcript, from which this was copied.

[g] Since the time that Bengel made this candid confeſſion, many more Greek MSS. have been examined, but the paſſage has been found in none. Wetſtein's liſt amounts to eighty-ſeven: to which may be added the Molſheim MS. (N°. 179. in my catalogue) collated by Father Goldhagen. It is true that Goldhagen does not ſay in expreſs terms, that this MS. omits 1 John v. 7.: but as his particular object was to confirm the readings of the vulgate, his ſilence at this place in regard to the Molſheim MS. is a tacit acknowledgement. Further, the famous manuſcript-thief Aymon was in poſſeſſion of a leaf, which he had torn out of a MS. containing the firſt Epiſtle of St. John, which he ſhewed to Mr. Uffenbach, and which omitted 1 John v. 7. See Uffenbach's Travels, Vol. III. p. 477. It is true that in this leaf, a modern hand had written the paſſage in the margin: but this may be done in every MS. if the margin has only ſufficient breadth. In the library belonging to the city of Bern, there is likewiſe a Greek MS. ſuppoſed to have been written in the ninth century, which omits the paſſage, as appears from the Catalogus Codd. MSS. bibliothecæ Bernenſis, publiſhed by I. R. Sinner de Ballaigues. Clark, in his Letters on Spain, relates that he did not find the paſſage, in the MSS. which he conſulted in the Spaniſh libraries: and Birch in his Letter publiſhed in the Orient. Bibl. Vol. XXIII. p. 152. declares that among all the

2. Though it is contained in the common printed editions of the Greek Teſtament, it was not inſerted on the authority of Greek manuſcripts: for the editors of the Complutenſian edition tranſlated it from Latin into Greek[h]: and from the Complutenſian, it was transferred to the other editions of the Greek Teſtament.

3. It is contained in no other ancient verſion, than the Latin. It is wanting in both Syriac verſions, in the Arabic, Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian and Ruſſian[i] verſions. It is true that in modern times the paſſage has been interpolated in the two laſt mentioned verſions: but in the former it was not interpolated before the fourteenth, and in the latter not before the ſeventeenth century.

4. Not all the manuſcripts even of the Latin verſion contain it[k]. In ſome it is totally omitted: in others it is found only in the margin, and of thoſe, which have it in the text, ſome place it before, others after, the earthly witneſſes.

5. The ancient Greek fathers have never quoted the paſſage, not even in thoſe places, where we ſhould the moſt expect it.

Conſequently we muſt either admit that the paſſage in queſtion is ſpurious, or we muſt allow, unleſs we chooſe

Greek MSS. which he had ſeen, the paſſage was contained in none: and he mentions particularly the celebrated Codex Vaticanus. Treſchow collated five Vienna MSS. (Lambec. 1. 34, 35, 36, 37.) all of which likewiſe omitted the paſſage: but in one of them, the Lambec, 35. a modern hand has added in the margin the two Latin words, alibi aliter. See Treſchow's Tentamen, p. 35. Laſtly, Matthäi has examined the Greek manuſcripts preſerved in the Moſcow libraries: but diſcovered the paſſage in none.

[h] Since Bengel's time this has been more fully confirmed by Semler in his 'More accurate inquiry into the ſtate of the Greek text of the Complutenſian New Teſtament.'

[i] See the ſecond volume of this Introduction, Ch. vii. Sect. 37.

[k] Since Bengel's time, Blanchini and Wetſtein have augmented the liſt of Latin MSS. which omit 1. John v. 7.: and ſince their time it has been augmented by the addition of ſeveral more, to which I will add a MS. (deſcribed in Uffenbach's Travels, Vol. III. p. 476.) which formerly belonged to Aymon.

chooſe to be inconſiſtent with ourſelves, that all other readings contained in ſome Latin manuſcripts, but rejected by all the Greek manuſcripts are genuine. In fact, it is very extraordinary that any man ſhould think of oppoſing the teſtimony of a ſingle verſion in favour of a paſſage to the united evidence of the Greek manuſcripts and all other verſions againſt it, when the copies even of that ſingle verſion are not unanimous in its favour, and the very copies, which contain it, are at variance in regard to its poſition.

SECT. III.

Of the authorities, which have been adduced in favour of 1 *John* v. 7.

THE authorities, which Bengel has produced in favour of this controverted paſſage, are copies of the Latin verſion, and certain Fathers, and Martyrs, who made uſe of the Latin verſion.

Now I readily grant that of the Latin manuſcripts, which we have at preſent, much the greateſt part contain 1 John v. 7. But it muſt be recollected, that no verſion has been ſo corrupted as the Latin, as appears from the teſtimony of Jerom himſelf. Originally there were ſeveral diſtinct Latin verſions, which by degrees were melted into one, but in ſuch a manner, that Jerom found no two copies alike. For the Latin tranſcribers took the moſt unwarranted liberties, they inſerted in one book of the New Teſtament, paſſages which they took from another, and frequently transferred into the text what they found written in the margin of the manuſcript, from which they copied. Under theſe circumſtances, every one muſt immediately ſuſpect, that a paſſage, which

is wanting in all the ancient Greek manuſcripts, and is likewiſe wanting in many ancient copies even of the Latin verſion, is an interpolation in thoſe Latin manuſcripts, which contain it. And in the preſent inſtance, the ſame cauſe, which has procured ſo many zealous advocates in favour of 1 John v. 7. was the principal cauſe of its introduction and general reception, namely, the importance of the doctrine which it contains.

I will apply what has been ſaid in the preceding paragraph to another inſtance of interpolation in the Latin verſion, and thence argue to the paſſage in queſtion. In St. John's Goſpel, ch. iii. 6. ſeveral ancient Latin MSS. added at the end of the verſe, what is found in no other verſion, and in no Greek manuſcript, 'quia Deus ſpiritus eſt.' This text was formerly quoted by the Latin fathers, in their diſpute about the Trinity, as a proof of the divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, and was defended with as much zeal as 1 John v. 7. has been defended in later ages. They likewiſe aſcribed the omiſſion of it in thoſe copies, which did not contain it, to the malice of the Arians. In ſeveral reſpects then, the addition made in the Latin verſion at 1 John v. 7. is ſimilar to that, which was made at John iii. 6. Moreover, the latter has been quoted by ſo early a writer as Tertullian, whoſe manuſcript of the Latin verſion did not contain the former. Much more therefore may be ſaid in favour of 'quia Deus Spiritus eſt' added in John iii. 6. than in favour of 1 John v. 7: and the one, as well as the other, may be uſed as a proof text in the doctrine of the Trinity. But I much doubt whether any of our Proteſtant divines would venture at preſent to defend the authenticity of 'quia Deus ſpiritus eſt;' and the Catholics have long ſince rejected it from their copies of the Vulgate. But if it be admitted that 'quia Deus ſpiritus eſt,' John iii. 6. is ſpurious, how is it poſſible to vindicate 1 John v. 7.?

The ancient writers, which Bengel has produced in favour of 1 John v. 7. are all Latin writers, for he acknowledges, that no Greek father has ever quoted it.

Now, if no objection could be made to Bengel's witneſſes, and the moſt ancient Latin fathers had quoted in expreſs terms the whole of the controverted paſſage, their quotations would prove nothing more than, that the paſſage ſtood in their manuſcripts of the Latin verſion, and therefore that the Latin verſion contained it in a very early age. But it will appear upon examination, that their evidence is very unſatisfactory.

The evidence of Tertullian, the oldeſt Latin writer, who has been quoted in favour of 1 John v. 7. is contained in the following paſſage of his treatiſe againſt Praxeas, B. I. ch. 25. Ita connexus patris in filio, et filii in paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes, alterum ex altero, qui *tres unum ſunt*, non unus, quomodo dictum eſt, 'ego et pater unum ſumus.' Hence it is inferred, that becauſe 'tres unum ſunt' ſtands at preſent in the Latin verſion at 1 John v. 7. theſe words ſtood there likewiſe in the time of Tertullian, and that Tertullian borrowed them from the Latin verſion. But this inference is wholly without foundation: for Tertullian does not produce theſe words as a quotation, and the bare circumſtance of his uſing the expreſſion, 'tres unum ſunt,' will not prove that he found that expreſſion in the Bible. On the contrary it is evident from what immediately follows, that 1 John v. 7. was *not* contained in the Latin verſion, when Tertullian wrote. For in proof of his aſſertion 'qui tres unum ſunt,' he immediately adds, quomodo dictum eſt, 'ego et pater unum ſumus,' which is a quotation from St. John's Goſpel, ch. x. 30. Now as this quotation relates only to the Father and the Son, and not to the Holy Ghoſt, ſurely Tertullian would not have proved the unity of the Trinity from this paſſage, if 1 John v. 7., which is much more to the purpoſe, had then been contained in any Latin manuſcript, with which he was acquainted. At any rate the mere uſe of the words 'tres unum ſunt' affords no argument in favour of the controverted paſſage: and if any inference is to be deduced from their agreement with our preſent copies of the Latin verſion in 1 John v. 7. it is this, that the

perſon, who afterwards fabricated this paſſage retained an expreſſion, which had been ſanctioned by the authority of Tertullian. So much for the evidence of this Latin father, the only writer of the ſecond century, to whom appeal has been made.

Of the Latin fathers, who lived in the third century, Cyprian alone has been produced as evidence in favour of 1 John v. 7. From the writings of Cyprian two paſſages have been quoted, as proofs, that 1 John v. 7. was contained in his manuſcript of the Latin verſion. The one is from his Epiſtle to Jubaianus, where Cyprian writes thus. Si baptizari quis apud hæreticum potuit, utique et remiſſam peccatorum conſequi potuit: ſi peccatorum remiſſam conſecutus eſt, et ſanctificatus eſt, et templum Dei factus eſt: quæro, cujus Dei? Si creatoris, non potuit, qui in eum non credidit: ſi Chriſti, non hujus poteſt fieri templum, qui negat Deum Chriſtum: ſi ſpiritus ſancti, *cum tres unum ſint*, quomodo ſpiritus ſanctus placatus eſſe ei poteſt, qui aut patris aut filii inimicus eſt? Here it muſt be obſerved that the words 'cum tres unum ſint,' though inſerted in the later editions of Cyprian's works, are *not* contained in that edition, which was publiſhed by Eraſmus: and even if they were genuine, they will prove nothing more, than the ſame words, juſt quoted from Tertullian. The other paſſage, which is much more to the purpoſe, is in Cyprian's treatiſe De unitate eccleſiæ, where Cyprian writes thus. Dicit dominus, Ego et pater unum ſumus: et iterum de patre et filio, et ſpiritu ſancto, *ſcriptum eſt: et tres unum ſunt*. Now admitting that the words 'et tres unum ſunt' were quoted by Cyprian from 1 John v. 7. I ſeriouſly aſk every impartial judge, whether a paſſage found in no ancient Greek manuſcript, quoted by no Greek father, and contained in no other ancient verſion than the Latin, is therefore to be pronounced genuine, merely becauſe one ſingle Latin father of the three firſt centuries, who was biſhop of Carthage, where the Latin verſion only was uſed, and where Greek was unknown, has quoted it? Under theſe circumſtances, ſhould

ſhould we conclude, that the paſſage ſtood originally in the Greek autograph of St. John? Certainly not: for the only inference, which could be deduced from Cyprian's quotation, would be this, that the paſſage had been introduced into the Latin verſion, ſo early as the third century.

The preceding anſwer is ſufficient to invalidate Cyprian's authority, in eſtabliſhing the authenticity of 1 John v. 7. on the ſuppoſition, that Cyprian really quoted it. But that he did ſo, is more than any man can prove. The words 'tres unum ſunt' are contained not only in the ſeventh, but likewiſe in the eighth verſe, which is a part of the ancient and genuine text of St. John: and therefore it is at leaſt poſſible, that Cyprian took them, not from the ſeventh, but from the eighth verſe. It is true that he ſays, theſe words are written of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, whereas 'tres unum ſunt' in the eighth verſe relates only to the ſpirit, the water, and the blood. But it muſt be obſerved that the Latin fathers interpreted ſpiritus, aqua, et ſanguis, not literally but myſtically, and ſome of them really underſtood by theſe words, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus ſanctus, taking aqua in the ſenſe of Pater, ſanguis in the ſenſe of Filius, and ſpiritus in the ſenſe of Spiritus ſanctus. This is expreſsly aſſerted by Eucherius, in his Quæſtiones N. T. difficiliores; for after having quoted 1 John v. 8. thus, Tria ſunt, quæ teſtimonium perhibent, aqua, ſanguis, et ſpiritus, he adds ſoon after, *plures* tamen hic ipſam interpretatione myſtica intelligere Trinitatem; aqua Patrem, ſanguine Chriſtum, ſpiritu Spiritum ſanctum manifeſtante. But if Cyprian really thought that aqua, ſanguis, et Spiritus 1 John v. 8. denoted Pater, Filius, et Spiritus ſanctus, he might ſay of tres unum ſunt ver. 8. that it was written 'de patre et filio, et ſpiritu ſancto.' And that he actually did ſo, that he quoted not ver. 7. but underſtood ver. 8. myſtically, appears from the following paſſage of Facundus [1], who

[1] Defenſio trium capitulorum concilii Chalcedonenſis, Lib. I. cap. 3.

who lived in the neighbourhood of Carthage, and conſequently uſed the ſame Latin verſion, as Cyprian. 'Johannes Apoſtolus in epiſtolâ ſuâ, de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu ſancto ſic dicit; Tres ſunt qui teſtimonium dant in terra[m], Spiritus, aqua, et ſanguis, et hi tres unum ſunt: in Spiritu ſignificans Patrem, &c. . . . . *quod Johannis Apoſtoli teſtimonium beatus Cyprianus, in epiſtola, ſive libro, quem de Trinitate ſcripſit, de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu ſancto dictum intelligit.*' Facundus then quotes the words of Cyprian, which are the ſubject of our preſent inquiry. From the preceding paſſage, it is manifeſt, that 1 John v. 7. was unknown to Facundus; for he proves the doctrine of the Trinity, by a myſtical interpretation of ver. 8., and appeals to the authority of Cyprian, who, he ſays, gave the ſame interpretation. But if 1 John v. 7. was unknown to Facundus, who lived in the ſame country as Cyprian, uſed the ſame Latin verſion, and wrote almoſt three centuries later, it is incredible that 1 John v. 7. was already introduced in the Latin manuſcripts, which Cyprian uſed. Conſequently we muſt conclude, that the aſſertion of Facundus is true, and that the words of Cyprian contain, not a quotation from 1 John v. 7. but a myſtical application of 1 John v. 8. This is further confirmed by Auguſtin, who was likewiſe an African biſhop, lived an hundred years later than Cyprian, and ſtill knew nothing of 1 John v. 7.: for he has never quoted this paſſage, not even where he ſpeaks of the Trinity[n], but he has myſtically applied the eighth verſe[o].

With

[m] 'In terra' is probably an addition made by later tranſcribers of the works of Facundus, who copied 1 John v. 8, as they found it in the Vulgate. For the controverted paſſage was unknown to Facundus, and therefore it is hardly credible that in his MS. of the Latin verſion, ver. 8. had the words 'in terra.'

[n] Bengel however will not therefore allow that 1 John v. 7. was unknown to Auguſtin, for he ſays in his Apparatus Criticus, p. 465. ed. 2d. Auguſtinus potius diſſimulanter tractavit hoc dictum, quam ignoravit: to which Semler has very properly replied, p. 388. of his Hiſtorical Collections.

[o] What I have here ſaid in a ſhort compaſs, the reader will find delivered at large in Semler's Hiſtorical Collections, p. 275. 353. 382.

With reſpect to the teſtimony of Phœbadius, Marius Victorinus Afer, Vigilius Thapſenſis[p], and other ſtill later Latin writers, which are produced by Bengel, as evidence for 1 John v. 7. their evidence is of no value whatſoever. For, even if no objection could be made to it, and it were abſolutely certain that all theſe late Latin writers quoted 1 John v. 7., the only inference to be drawn would be this, that from the time of the fourth century, the paſſage ſtood in ſeveral copies of the Latin verſion. But will any man therefore conclude that it was not an interpolation in thoſe copies, when Auguſtin, a Latin biſhop of the fourth century, and Facundus another Latin biſhop, who lived ſo late as the ſixth century, were either ſo ignorant of it, or ſo perſuaded of its ſpuriouſneſs, that they were reduced to the neceſſity of proving the doctrine of the Trinity, by a myſtical interpretation of the eighth verſe? It is really immaterial, whether the paſſage was interpolated into the Latin verſion, in the fourth, or in a later century; for an interpolation it certainly is. In ſhort, though the advocates of 1 John v. 7., derive their chief ſupport from the Latin fathers, they really injure their cauſe by producing them.

I know not whether my readers will excuſe my noticing a very frivolous objection made by Mr. Wagner, in the treatiſe, which I mentioned in the preceding ſection. He ſays, I have taken for granted, without proving it, that thoſe Latin fathers, who have quoted the controverted paſſage, quoted it, not from the Greek original, but from the Latin verſion. Now I really thought it unneceſſary to give any ſuch proof, becauſe I imagined, that every man, who had ſtudied theology, had learnt enough of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, to know the Latin fathers in general did not underſtand Greek, and conſequently,

382. 398. To Semler's arguments, Knittel has made ſeveral learned and ſpecious objections in his New Criticiſms, p. 32, &c. But learned and ſpecious as they are, they have not convinced me that Semler is miſtaken.

[p] I omit Eucherius, for reaſons, which are aſſigned by Semler.

ſequently, that they could uſe only the verſion of their country. Jerom indeed makes an exception, for he was well acquainted with the Greek language: but Jerom is not one of thoſe Latin fathers, who have quoted 1 John v. 7. for he has taken no notice of it in any part of his very voluminous works, as Bengel himſelf acknowledges[q]. It is true, that in the Prologue to the Catholic Epiſtles, which has been aſcribed to Jerom, the paſſage is both mentioned and defended[r]: but this Prologue is falſely aſcribed to Jerom, as Martianay has very clearly ſhewn[s], and as Bengel, with his uſual candour has admitted.

Laſtly, the advocates of 1 John v. 7. lay great ſtreſs on the Confeſſion of Faith, which was drawn up by Eugenius at the end of the fifth century, and preſented by the orthodox biſhops of Africa to Hunerich, King of the Vandals, who had been converted to Arianiſm. In this confeſſion, which is recorded by Victor Vitenſis, in his Hiſtoria perſecutionis Vandalicæ, is the following paſſage[t]. Ut adhuc luce clarius unius divinitatis eſſe cum Patre et Filio Spiritum ſanctum doceamus, Joannis Evangeliſtæ teſtimonio comprobatur. Ait namque: *Tres ſunt qui teſtimonium perhibent in cœlo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus ſanctus, et hi tres unum ſunt.* Numquid ait, tres in differenti æqualitate ſejuncti, aut quibuſlibet diverſitatum gradibus longo ſeparationis intervallo diviſi? Sed *tres*, inquit, *unum ſunt.* Here 1 John v. 7. is clearly and diſtinctly quoted: but this proves nothing in reſpect to

[q] However, notwithſtanding Jerom's total ſilence, Bengel is unwilling to admit Jerom's ignorance of it: for he ſays, § 20. Hieronymus potius diſſimulanter tractavit dictum, quam ignoravit.

[r] The words of the Prologue relative to this paſſage are, In qua etiam ab infidelibus tranſlatoribus multum erratum eſſe, fidei veritate comperimus: trium tantum vocabula, hoc eſt, aquæ, ſanguinis, et Spiritus, in ſua editione ponentes, et Patris, Verbique, ac Spiritus teſtimonium omittentes: quo maxime fides Catholica roboratur, et Patris, et Filii, ac Spiritus ſancti una divinitatis ſubſtantia comprobatur.

[s] In his edition of Jerom's Works, Vol. I. p. 1670—1675.

[t] See p. 29. of Ruinart's edition.

to its authenticity, for the only inference which we can deduce is, that the paſſage was contained in the Latin manuſcripts, then uſed in Africa. We may infer that Eugenius, who drew up the confeſſion, found the paſſage in his Latin manuſcript; but that all the biſhops, who ſigned this confeſſion, found the quoted paſſage likewiſe in their manuſcripts, is a very unwarrantable inference. For, when a formulary of religious articles is compoſed, however numerous the perſons may be, who ſet their names to it, it is in fact the work only of him, who drew it up: and a ſubſcription to ſuch a formulary, though it conveys a general aſſent to the doctrines contained in it, by no means implies, that every ſubſcriber has, previous to his ſubſcription, examined every argument adduced, or every quotation, that is alleged in it, and obtained a thorough conviction, that not one of them is exceptionable. I believe no man would venture to affirm this of all thoſe, who ſubſcribe to the Symbolic Books of the Lutheran church: and yet our Symbolic Books were certainly drawn up with full as much care and accuracy, as the Confeſſion of Faith, which the orthodox biſhops of Africa preſented to Hunerich.

But, it is ſaid, the Arians themſelves, who were preſent, when this Confeſſion was delivered, made no objection to the quotation, 'Tres ſunt qui teſtimonium perhibent in cœlo, &c.:' that they acknowledged therefore by their very ſilence, that the paſſage was not ſpurious. Now this is a very weak and even abſurd argument. For, in the firſt place, we have no further knowledge of this tranſaction, than what the orthodox themſelves have given of it: and therefore it is not fair, to conclude, that the Arians made no objections, merely from the circumſtance, that no objections are on record. Secondly, if the concluſion were admiſſible, nay, were it abſolutely certain, that the Arians, who were preſent at this conference, admitted, 'Tres ſunt qui teſtimonium perhibent in cælo, &c.' it would follow only, that the paſſage was in their Latin manuſcripts,

ſcripts, as the quotation of it ſhews, that it was in the Latin manuſcript of Eugenius, who drew up the Confeſſion. For theſe Arians were Vandals, who had been driven out of Spain into Africa, who read the Bible only in the Latin tranſlation, and were totally unacquainted with Greek. Conſequently their ſilence on the quotation of a paſſage from the Latin tranſlation, at the end of the fifth century, affords no preſumption whatſoever, that the paſſage exiſted in the Greek original. Laſtly, the whole tranſaction between Hunerich with his Arian Vandals, on the one ſide, and the orthodox biſhops of Africa on the other, was of ſuch a nature, as was very ill adapted to the deciſion of a critical queſtion. For theſe Vandals did not combat by argument, but by force: and they brought their adverſaries to ſilence, not by reaſoning with them, but by cutting out their tongues. To argue therefore from the ſilence of ſuch men to the authenticity of 1 John v. 7. is nearly the ſame, as an appeal in its favour to the teſtimony of a Ruſſian corporal.

SECT. IV.

The Alogi did not reject the firſt Epiſtle of St. John: conſequently in their time, that is, in the ſecond century, the Epiſtle did not contain the controverted paſſage.

IN the ſecond century there aroſe a ſect, to which Epiphanius has given the title of Alogi[u], becauſe they would not admit the application of the term Λογος to

[u] That the Alogi appeared ſo early as the ſecond century is certain. For Theodotus, whom Epiphanius (Hæreſ. 54. al. 34.) deſcribes as, αποσπασμα εκ της Αλογου αιρεσεως, lived in the time of the emperor Severus. See Euſebii Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. V. cap. 28. p. 252, 253. ed. Reading.

to Chriſt. The reaſon, which they aſſigned, was, that Cerinthus had applied the term in this manner: whence they argued, that it could not have been thus uſed by an Apoſtle. Accordingly, they rejected both St. John's Goſpel, and the Apocalypſe: and they not only denied, that St. John was the author of theſe two books, but even aſcribed them to Cerinthus. It is evident therefore, that men of this deſcription muſt have rejected likewiſe the firſt Epiſtle of St. John, if in their time it had contained the controverted paſſage: for there the term Λογος is undoubtedly applied to the ſecond perſon of the Trinity. If then it can be ſhewn, that the Alogi made no objection to this Epiſtle, we muſt conclude, that ch. v. 7. was not contained in the Greek manuſcripts, which exiſted in the ſecond century: for had it been contained in any copies, however few, ſo remarkable a paſſage could not have remained unknown to them.

The oldeſt writer, who has given any account of theſe perſons, is Philaſtrius,[f] who expreſsly declares, that they rejected St. John's Goſpel, and the Apocalypſe; but he ſays nothing of their rejection of any of his Epiſtles[f]. The next writer, who has mentioned this ſect, is Epiphanius, who collected, with the utmoſt zeal, all hiſtorical information, which he could obtain, againſt the heretics, and has frequently charged them with more than his information warranted. But in the preſent inſtance, though he has aſſerted that the Alogi rejected the Goſpel of St. John and the Apocalypſe, and ſometimes ſpeaks in indefinite terms of their rejecting St. John's writings, yet when he mentions St. John's Epiſtles in particular, he does not ſay, that the Alogi rejected theſe likewiſe; he hints only a private ſuſpicion, that

[f] Philaſtrii Hæreſ. LX. or (according to ſome editions), Hæreſis, quæ ſub Apoſtolis extitit XIII. The ſuperſcription is, Hæreſis, Evangelium Johannis, et Apocalypſin ipſius rejiciens: and the firſt words of the text are, Poſt hos ſunt hæretici, qui Evangelium ſecundum Joannem, et Apocalypſin ipſius non recipient.

that they *perhaps* did ſo. I will quote the words of Epiphanius, Hæreſ. LI. § 3. that the reader may judge for himſelf. Ειχον την αἱρεσιν καλεμενην, αποβαλλεσαν Ιωαννε τας βιβλες. Επει εν τον λογον ε δεχονται τον παρα Ιωαννε κεκηρυγμενον, Αλογοι κληθησονται αλλοτριοι τοινυν παντ,παασιν ὑπαρχοντες τε κηρυγματος της αληθειας, αρνενται το καθαρον κηρὺγματος, και ετε το τε Ιωαννε Ευαγγελιεν δεχονται, ετε την αυτε Αποκαλυψιν. Και ει μεν εδεχοντο το Ευαγγελιον, την δε Αποκάλυψιν απεβαλλοντο, ελεγομεν αν, μη πη αρα κατα ακριβολογιαν τετο ποιενται, αποκρυφον μη δεχομενοι δια τα εν τη Αποκαλυψει βαθεως και σκοτεινως ειρημενα. Ὁ ποτε δε ε δεχονται φυσει τα βιβλια τα απο τε ἁγιε Ιωαννε κεκηρυγμενα, παντι τῳ δηλον ειη, ὁτι ἑτοι εισι, και οἱ ὁμοιοι τετοις, περι ὡν ειπεν ὁ ἁγιος Ιωαννης εν ταις καθολικαις επιςολαις, ὁτι εσχατη ὡρα εςι, και ηκεσατε ὁτι αντιχριςος ερχεται, και νυν ιδε αντιχριςοι πολλοι, και τα εξης. Here Epiphanius twice ſpeaks in indefinite terms of the writings of St. John, as if the Alogi rejected them all: yet, when he ſpecifies thoſe, which they rejected, he names only the Goſpel, and the Apocalypſe, as he does alſo, Hæreſ. LIV. § 1. where he ſays, that the Alogi rejected το κατα Ιωαννην Ευαγγελιον, και τον εν αυτῳ εν αρχη ὀντα Θεον λογον, και την αυτε Αποκαλυψιν, but ſays nothing of the Epiſtles. And the following paſſage, Hæreſ. LI. § 34. puts the matter out of doubt; where likewiſe ſpeaking of the Alogi he ſays, Επειρονται δε παλιν τη διανοια οἱ αυτοι λεξιθηρευτες απειρως, ἱνα δοξωσι παρεκβαλλειν τα τε ἁγιε Αποςολε βιβλια, φημι δε Ιωαννε τοτε Ευαγγελιον, και την Αποκαλυψιν· ταχα δε και τας Επιςολας, συναδσι γαρ και αὐται τῳ Ευαγγελιῳ, και τη Αποκαλυψει. Hence it appears,

1. That Epiphanius, by his own confeſſion, means only the Goſpel, and the Apocalypſe, when he ſays, that the Alogi rejected the writings of St. John.

2. That he is inclined indeed to excite a ſuſpicion, that they rejected perhaps the Epiſtles alſo; but that he is not able to bring any evidence in ſupport of this ſuſpicion, or any confeſſion from the Alogi themſelves.

Further, Epiphanius, who writes as a man well acquainted with the works of the Alogi, delivers, at full length,

length, their objections to the writings of St. John: but among all theſe objections, there is not one, which is directed againſt St. John's Epiſtles, for they relate entirely to the Goſpel and the Apocalypſe.

Laſtly, the other eccleſiaſtical writers, who ſpeak of the Alogi, namely, Auguſtin[g], John of Damaſcus[h], and the anonymous author of the work called, Prædeſtinatus, ſive prædeſtinatorum hæreſis[i], agree in the aſſertion, that they rejected St. John's Goſpel, and the Apocalypſe: but not one of them has aſſerted, that the Alogi rejected his firſt Epiſtle.

The premiſes therefore, laid down in the title of this ſection, being thus eſtabliſhed, the inference follows of courſe.

SECT. V.

Of the reaſons alleged for retaining 1 John v. 7. *though the evidence of manuſcripts, fathers, and verſions is decidedly againſt it.*

ONE ſhould ſuppoſe, that no critic, eſpecially if a proteſtant, would heſitate a moment to condemn as ſpurious, a paſſage, which is contained in no ancient Greek manuſcript, is quoted by no Greek father, was unknown to the Alogi in the ſecond century, is wanting

[g] Hæreſ. XXX.

[h] Joannis Damaſceni Opp. Hæreſ. LI. p. 88. οἱ τὸ Ευαγγελιον τὸ κατα Ιωαννην αθετηντες, και την Αποκαλυψιν αυτου, δια το τον ελθοντα εκ του πατρος θεον λογον, οντα αει, μη δεχεσθαι.

[i] Bibliotheca Patrum maxima, Tom. XXVII. p. 549. Triceſima hæreſis Alogorum ſic vocata, quia Verbum Dei eſſe filium, accipere nolunt, in tantum, ut Evangelium S. Joannis ipſius non eſſe; nec Apocalypſin accipiunt ejuſdem Joannis.

ing in both Syriac verſions, in both Arabic verſions, in the Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Slavonian verſions, is contained only in the Latin, and is wanting in many manuſcripts even of this verſion, was quoted by none of the Latin fathers of the four firſt centuries, and to ſome of them, who lived ſo late as the ſixth century, was either wholly unknown, or was not received by them as genuine. To this immenſe weight of evidence againſt 1 John v. 7. its advocates oppoſe the following reaſons for retaining it.

In the firſt place there is ſomething divine, θειον quoddam, as Bengel[k] expreſſes it, both in the paſſage itſelf, and the preſervation of it. But in what this θειον quoddam conſiſts, I really do not know: for Bengel did not mean the divine doctrine, which the paſſage contains, ſince he was really too good a critic to conclude, that a text was genuine, for no other reaſon, than becauſe its contents were orthodox. Nor can this θειον quoddam be ſought in the preſervation of the paſſage: for if a genuine paſſage of the New Teſtament has been loſt in the Greek, in the Syriac, in the Arabic, and in ſhort in every other than the Latin Bible, it cannot be ſaid, that divine Providence has particularly watched for its preſervation. If this θειον quoddam conſiſts in a certain internal ſenſation, excited by the reading of the paſſage, this ſenſation, if felt only by thoſe, who already receive the paſſage as genuine, cannot be uſed as an argument, when the queſtion is in agitation, whether it be genuine[l], or not. In other inſtances, Bengel would not have appealed to ſuch a criterion: and indeed if he had, his whole Apparatus Criticus would have been ſuperfluous.

Further, the following reaſons are aſſigned, which might have occaſioned the omiſſion of 1 John v. 7.

1. That

[k] Sect. 28.

[l] Bengel himſelf ſays only, 'apud eos ſaltem, qui dictum accipiunt.'

1. That the ſeventh verſe begins and ends in the ſame manner as the eighth: and therefore that tranſcribers might have eaſily overlooked the ſeventh verſe, and conſequently have omitted it by mere accident.

2. That the Arians might have deſignedly expunged it, as being inimical to their doctrine [m].

3. That the orthodox themſelves might have deſignedly withdrawn it, ex ſtudio arcani, as Bengel [n] ſays, that is, out of regard to the myſtery of the Trinity, and under the perſuaſion, that ſuch a paſſage as 1 John v. 7. ought not to be expoſed to every reader.

Without examining the ſtrength or weakneſs of theſe reaſons, I will only obſerve, that ſuch cauſes, though they might have produced the omiſſion of the paſſage in ſome copies, could not poſſibly have occaſioned it, in all the ancient Greek manuſcripts, and in all the ancient verſions, except the Latin. Beſides, they are wholly foreign to the preſent purpoſe: they do not tend to ſhew the authenticity of 1 John v. 7. but account merely for its omiſſion, on the previous ſuppoſition, that it is authentic. But this is the thing to be proved. And it is ſurely abſurd, to account for the omiſſion of a paſſage in St. John's firſt Epiſtle, before it has been ſhewn, that the Epiſtle ever contained it. Suppoſe I were to cite a man before a court of juſtice, and demand from him a ſum of money, that on being aſked by the magiſtrate, whether I had any bond to produce, in ſupport of the demand, I anſwered, that I had indeed no bond to produce, but that a bond might have been very eaſily loſt during the troubles of the late war. In this caſe, if the magiſtrate ſhould admit the validity of the demand, and oblige the accuſed party to pay the ſum

[m] The Latin fathers ſaid this of the interpolation 'quia Deus ſpiritus eſt,' John iii. 6. but they did not ſay the ſame of 1 John v. 7. The charge of having expunged this paſſage has been laid to the Arians only in modern times, and by writers, who certainly would not undertake to defend the authenticity of the former.

[n] Sect. 25.

ſum required, every man would conclude, not ſo much that he was unjuſt, as that his mental faculties were deranged. But is not this caſe ſimilar to the caſe of thoſe, who contend, that 1 John v. 7. is genuine, becauſe, it *might* have been loſt? In fact, their ſituation is ſtill worſe, ſince the loſs of a ſingle manuſcript is much more credible, than the loſs of one and the ſame paſſage in more than eighty manuſcripts.

Laſtly, Bengel entertained hopes, that Greek manuſcripts would hereafter be diſcovered, which contained the paſſage. Now, till ſuch manuſcripts are actually produced, the hope of diſcovering them will not ſupply their place. And if we may judge from experience, all hope of diſcovering any ſuch manuſcripts is now at an end: for ſince Bengel's time, a great number of Greek manuſcripts, with which he was unacquainted, have been examined, but none of them contain the controverted paſſage.

SECT. VI.

In what manner 1 *John* v. 7. *was firſt introduced into the Latin verſion, and afterwards into our printed editions of the Greek Teſtament.*

WHEN it has been proved by ſatisfactory evidence, that a paſſage is ſpurious, it is wholly unneceſſary to ſhew at what time, or in what manner, the paſſage was firſt introduced. There are many readings in our common printed text, which at preſent are univerſally allowed to be falſe, though we cannot aſcertain by what copyiſt they were firſt written, or what particular cauſe has given them birth. In ſuch caſes we muſt be ſatisfied with probable conjecture; for hiſtorical evidence is ſeldom

ſeldom to be expected, ſince interpolations are in general clandeſtine facts, and are very rarely recorded. But ſince the advocates of 1 John v. 7. contend, that this paſſage would not have been contained in the Latin verſion, unleſs it had been contained likewiſe in the Greek, I will endeavour to ſhew in what manner it was firſt introduced into the Latin verſion.

The ſimple fact, that it had it's origin in the Latin, is indiſputable, ſince it is contained in no ancient Greek manuſcript, and in no other verſion[o]. And the cauſe, which gave it birth, was probably the following. It appears from the third ſection of this chapter, that the African fathers interpreted 1 John v. 8. myſtically, and conſidered 'the ſpirit, the water, and the blood,' as denoting the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt. Further it muſt be remarked, that the African fathers, were the firſt, who diſcovered 1 John v. 7. in the Latin verſion. The combination of theſe two facts leads to the following probable concluſion: that the ſpiritual interpretation of 1 John v. 8. was written in the margin of one or more Latin manuſcripts[p], and that, in order to diſtinguiſh the terreſtrial from the celeſtial meaning, the words 'in terra' were added as a marginal gloſs, in reference to 'teſtimonium dant' in the eighth verſe, by which means both the literal and the ſpiritual meaning were rendered perfect. According to this repreſentation the text and the margin ſtood thus.

* in terra.	
Et tres ſunt, qui teſtimonium dant in cœlo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus: et hi tres unum ſunt,	Quoniam tres ſunt, qui teſtimonium dant *, ſpiritus, et aqua, et ſanguis; et hi tres unum ſunt.

When

[o] There is no verſion, in which ſo many, and ſo long interpolations have been made, as in the Latin.

[p] Marginal gloſſes were very common in the Latin manuſcripts.

When a copy of this kind fell into the hands of ignorant tranſcribers, who were making new tranſcripts of the Latin Bible, they imagined, that what was written in the margin was a part of the text, which had been omitted by miſtake; conſequently they inſerted it in the text of the manuſcript, which they themſelves were writing. But ſome of them inſerted the marginal reading before the text, of which it was the interpretation, others after it: and this is the reaſon why the controverted paſſage has no fixed place in the Latin manuſcripts, the heavenly witneſſes ſometimes preceding, ſometimes following the earthly witneſſes [q].

In this manner the paſſage having gained admittance into one or more Latin manuſcripts written in Africa, it had the undeſerved good fortune to be quoted in the Confeſſion of Faith, preſented at the end of the fifth century by the African biſhops to Hunerich, king of the Vandals [r]. And as theſe biſhops became martyrs, and were ſaid even to have performed a miracle [s], the paſſage in conſequence of its having been quoted in their Confeſſion, not only acquired celebrity, but was ſtamped with authority. Hence other Latin tranſcribers, eſpecially they, who lived in Africa, were induced to follow the example of thoſe, who transferred the paſſage from the margin to the text. And, as the Carthaginian and Roman churches were cloſely allied, this example ſoon ſpread itſelf to the tranſcribers, who lived in Italy. It muſt be obſerved however, that the example was not imitated univerſally: for Facundus, who lived in the ſixth century, did not find the paſſage in his manuſcript of the Latin verſion. This appears from

[q] In the modern tranſcripts of the Vulgate, the former arrangement generally prevails: but Bengel preferred the latter.

[r] That this quotation is no argument for the authenticity of the paſſage, has been ſhewn in the third ſection of this chapter.

[s] It was aſſerted, that they ſpake after their tongues were cut out.

from the circumſtance, that he proves the doctrine of the Trinity by a myſtical interpretation of the eighth verſe: which he certainly would not have done, if the ſeventh verſe had been contained in his manuſcript, becauſe in this verſe the doctrine, which he intended to prove, is literally and directly aſſerted. After the ſixth century, the whole Latin church was involved in ignorance and barbariſm: all critical inquiries were at an end: and both ſpurious and genuine paſſages were received without diſtinction. In the middle ages therefore, 1 John v. 7. was generally conſidered throughout the weſt of Europe, as a part of St. John's firſt Epiſtle, without any further queſtions being aſked about it.

At the revival of letters, and the reſtoration of Greek literature, it was diſcovered, that, though the paſſage had gained admittance into the Vulgate, it was not contained in the Greek manuſcripts. Accordingly, Eraſmus printed his two firſt editions of the Greek Teſtament without it: that is, he printed the text of St. John's firſt Epiſtle as he found it in Greek manuſcripts. This gave great offence to the members of the church of Rome, whoſe oracle was the Vulgate: and who concluded, from the omiſſion of the paſſage in the Greek manuſcripts, not that it was ſpurious, but that the Greeks had maliciouſly eraſed it. Eraſmus however did not think proper to tranſlate the paſſage from Latin into Greek, and to inſert it without authority: but he promiſed to inſert it in his next edition, if a Greek manuſcript could be diſcovered, which contained it. Before the publication of his third edition he received intelligence, that ſuch a manuſcript exiſted in England, and likewiſe a tranſcript from this manuſcript of the place in queſtion. From this tranſcript Eraſmus inſerted the controverted paſſage in his third and following editions, 'ne cui ſit cauſa calumniandi.' From thoſe editions others were copied, and others again from theſe, till at length 1 John v. 7. became as general in

the printed edition of the Greek Teſtament, as it was in the Latin verſion [t].

SECT. VII.

Luther did not admit 1 *John* v. 7. *into his German tranſlation of the Bible.*

NEITHER the truth of the doctrine, which this controverted paſſage contains, nor the clamours of the Catholics againſt thoſe, who rejected the paſſage, could induce Luther to inſert a tranſlation of it in his German Bible. He muſt therefore have believed, that the Complutenſian editors did not derive it from ancient Greek manuſcripts; and that the Codex Britannicus, from which it came into the third edition of Eraſmus, was a manuſcript of no authority. This ſuſpicion has been fully confirmed by later inquiries: and at preſent it is well known, that the Codex Britannicus, which is no other than the Codex Montfortianus, is a very modern manuſcript. Luther's critical learning was not equal to that of Eraſmus: but in ſtrength of underſtanding no man ever ſurpaſſed him, and in reſolution and integrity he was ſuperior to all the learned of his age. In the preſent inſtance at leaſt he ventured further, than any other tranſlator, who lived at that time in the weſt of Europe, would have done: and not only did not tranſlate it in his firſt edition of the German

[t] It has been likewiſe interpolated in the editions of the Greek Teſtament, which are uſed by the Greeks of the preſent age. In the laſt century, it was interpolated in the Slavonian, or Ruſſian verſion: and in the Armenian verſion, it was interpolated ſo early as the end of the thirteenth century, in the time of king Haitho, who was ſtrongly attached to the church of Rome.

German Bible, but refuſed to admit it, as long as he lived, in any of the ſubſequent editions [u].

The laſt edition, which was printed, while Luther was living, and indeed was not quite finiſhed till after his death, was that of 1546. In the preface to this edition, which comes immediately after the title page, he delivers the following requeſt. 'Dr. Martin Luther. I requeſt my friends, and my foes, my maſters, printers, and readers, to let this New Teſtament continue mine. If they find faults in it, let them make another. I know well what I make, I ſee alſo well, what others make. But this Teſtament ſhall remain Luther's German Teſtament. Now a days there is neither meaſure nor end of mending and bettering. Let every man therefore take heed of falſe copies, for I know how unfaithfully and untruly others have reprinted what I have printed.' Now one ſhould ſuppoſe, that every author has a right to expect, that a requeſt, like this, would be granted; and that, ſince he never admitted 1 John v. 7. into any edition of his German tranſlation, no future editor would preſume to inſert it, and ſtill retain the name of 'Luther's tranſlation' on the title. But Luther had not been dead thirty years, when the paſſage was interpolated in his German tranſlation.

The firſt edition [w], in which this act of injuſtice took place, and in which Luther's text at leaſt was corrupted, is that, which was printed at Francfort in 1574. But in the edition of 1583, printed in the ſame place, and alſo in ſeveral ſtill later Francfort editions, the paſſage was again omitted. The oldeſt Wittenberg edition, which received it, was that of 1596: and in the Wittenberg edition of 1599 it is likewiſe contained, but is printed in Roman characters. In 1596 it was inſerted alſo in the Low German Bible, printed in that year at Hamburg.

[u] See the Memoirs of a Library in Halle, Vol. III. p. 16. N. 202.

[w] See the 'Catalogue of Bibles in the poſſeſſion of the Dowager Ducheſs of Brunſwick.'

Hamburg. In the ſeventeenth century, if we except the Wittenberg edition of 1697, which remained true to Luther's text, the inſertion was general: and of the editions, which have been printed in the preſent century, I know of none, which does not contain it. Later editors however are much more excuſable, than the firſt corrupters of Luther's text. For not every one knows at preſent, that the paſſage was never admitted into any of Luther's own editions: and they, who do know it, would not be permitted perhaps in every univerſity, to print Luther's tranſlation, which is the eſtabliſhed verſion of our country, without the paſſage.

Knittel[x] has endeavoured to ſhew, that Luther altered his opinion, and in the latter part of his life allowed, that the paſſage was genuine: whence Knittel infers, that Luther muſt have ſeen the paſſage in a Greek manuſcript. But I cannot admit the premiſes, and ſtill leſs the concluſion[y]. It is true, that Luther rejected in poſitive terms 1 John v. 7. in a public lecture delivered in 1522 becauſe (to uſe his own words) 'it was not contained in the Greek Bibles:' but that in a lecture delivered many years afterwards, at leaſt after the year 1532, he did not repeat this aſſertion, on the contrary, that he read 1 John v. 7. from the Greek Teſtament, and even explained it. But this argument proves nothing. For the aſſertion, which Luther had made in 1522, that the paſſage was not contained in the Greek Bibles, though true at that time, was not true ten years afterwards, and conſequently Luther could not repeat it after the year 1532. Namely, the editions of the Greek Teſtament publiſhed before 1522 did not contain the paſſage: but in almoſt all the editions publiſhed after that year, it was inſerted. As to the circumſtance, that Luther in his latter lecture, explained 1 John v. 7. after he had read it from the Greek

[x] New Criticiſms on 1 John v. 7. p. 131—138.

[y] See the Neue Orient. Bibl. Vol. II. p. 132—137. where I have reviewed Knittel's work.

Greek Teſtament, without entering into any critical inquiry in reſpect to its authenticity, it ſhews nothing more, than that Luther diſtinguiſhed exegetical from critical lectures, and that in explaining the Greek Teſtament, he interpreted what he and his hearers had before them. That he then received it as genuine, is an inference, which we are not warranted to make: and indeed it would be inconſiſtent with his unremitting reſolution to reject it from his German tranſlation, and with his laſt requeſt, in the preface to that very edition, during the printing of which, he died.

Before I conclude this ſection, I muſt make the following remarks.

1. Whether it be granted, that 1 John v. 7. is ſpurious, or whether it be not, it is no part of Luther's verſion, and they, who have inſerted it have been guilty of an act of injuſtice to the author.

2. It is not only unjuſt, but injudicious, to inſert 1 John v. 7. in Luther's catechiſm. For children are thus accuſtomed to conſider this paſſage as the chief proof of the doctrine of the Trinity: the conſequence of which is, that, when they are grown up, and have been informed, that the paſſage is ſpurious, they naturally conclude, that the doctrine itſelf is ungrounded.

3. It is uncandid in the extreme, when one proteſtant condemns another for rejecting 1 John v. 7. ſince it was rejected by the author of our reformation. Nor can it be ſaid, that Luther, were he now alive, would be of a different opinion, ſince every inquiry, which has been inſtituted ſince the age of Luther, has brought to light freſh evidence, not in favour of the paſſage, but againſt it.

CHAP. XXXII.

OF THE TWO LAST EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN.

SECT. I.

Of the canonical authority of theſe two Epiſtles.

IN the fourth century, when Euſebius wrote his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, the ſecond and third Epiſtles of St. John were not reckoned among the ὁμολογουμενα, but were in the number of the αντιλεγομενα, or books received by ſome, and rejected by others. Nor have they been admitted into the ancient Syriac verſion, which is the eſtabliſhed verſion of the Syrian churches. Yet they are ſo ſimilar to the firſt Epiſtle, both in the thoughts, and in the ſtyle, that in my opinion, they were certainly written by the ſame perſon, who wrote the firſt, that is, by St. John the Apoſtle. Nor is it eaſy to comprehend what could have induced an impoſtor to forge two ſuch Epiſtles, or what advantage he could have propoſed by the introduction of them. For they contain nothing, which had not been already ſaid in the firſt Epiſtle, except commendation or cenſure either of unnamed perſons, or of Demetrius and Diotrephes, of whom no one knows what they were. They could not have been forged during St. John's life, for the impoſture muſt have been immediately detected: and, if they had been forged after his death, it is not very probable that the impoſtor would have made the pretended author promiſe at the end of each Epiſtle, that he would ſhortly pay a viſit to thoſe, to whom the Epiſtles were addreſſed.

The reaſon, why theſe two Epiſtles were not univerſally admitted, in the early ages of Chriſtianity, into the collection of writings called the New Teſtament, has not been

been hitherto aſcertained. It may be aſked, whether they were written after the canon was already formed: or whether it was thought unneceſſary to retain two Epiſtles, which were of a confined and perſonal nature: or whether the addreſs, with which each of them begins, occaſioned the ſuppoſition that they were not written by St. John the Apoſtle.

The laſt mentioned cauſe appears to me the moſt probable. The author neither calls himſelf John, nor aſſumes the title of an Apoſtle: but names himſelf ſimply 'the elder,' (ὁ πρεσβυτερος). Now St. John might with the ſame propriety call himſelf πρεσβυτερος, as St. Peter has called himſelf συμπρεσβυτερος [z]; and after the death of St. Peter, the title ὁ πρεσβυτερος might have been applied excluſively to St. John, who was the only Apoſtle then living, conſequently the oldeſt Chriſtian, and therefore, literally the elder and father of the whole church. But ſince the ſeniors of each Chriſtian community were likewiſe called πρεσβυτεροι, it was imagined that the author of theſe two Epiſtles was not an Apoſtle, but a ſenior or preſbyter of ſome Chriſtian community. And, as there lived at Epheſus, at the ſame time with St. John the Apoſtle, another John, who had the office of ſenior or preſbyter in the Epheſian church, it was ſuppoſed that this John, and not the Apoſtle, was the author of theſe two Epiſtles. But whoever aſcribed them to John the Preſbyter could not receive them as a part of the ſacred canon.

In modern times, an objection has been made to the opinion, that St. John the Apoſtle was the author, drawn from a compariſon of St. John's amiable character with an apparently ſevere precept delivered in the ſecond Epiſtle, ver. 10, 11. Here the author ſays, 'If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your houſe, neither greet him: for he that greeteth him is partaker of his evil deeds.' Now it is aſſerted that St. John the Apoſtle, whoſe writings are replete with precepts of love and charity, would hardly have given the uncharitable command to refuſe the rites of hoſpitality

[z] 1 Pet. v. 1.

pitality to all thoſe, who differed from us in religious opinions: and that this command in particular would have come with great impropriety from St. John, ſince no man more ſenſibly felt the violation of theſe rites than himſelf[a]. Hence it is inferred that he was not the author, at leaſt of the ſecond Epiſtle.

If the paſſage juſt quoted be detached from the reſt of the Epiſtle, and the doctrine, which it contains, be taken in its utmoſt latitude, I own that the argument is very ſpecious. However it may be explained in ſuch a manner, as to remove all difficulty. The Greek expreſſion χαιρειν αυτῳ uſed in the original, does not denote an ordinary ſalutation, ſuch as we make to indifferent perſons, when we meet them in the ſtreet, but involves in it a kind of bleſſing, like the expreſſion, 'Peace be with thee[b].' And it is evident from the context, that the ſubject here relates to the bleſſing uſually received, on entering the houſe of a friend, or an aſſurance of hearty welcome. For that which is meant by the words λαμβανειν αυτον εις οικιαν, και χαιρειν αυτῳ ver. 10. is compriſed in the ſingle phraſe χαιρειν αυτῳ in the 11th verſe. Now it muſt be obſerved, that among the primitive Chriſtrians, it was the cuſtom to receive all travelling brethren, and to entertain them during their ſtay, which was ſometime done at the expence of the whole community by perſons appointed for that purpoſe. That the third Epiſtle relates to the reception and entertainment of travelling Chriſtians, eſpecially of thoſe who travelled to preach the Goſpel, is evident from ver. 5—11. But the ſecond Epiſtle is ſo ſimilar to the third, that we may conclude the ſame of that alſo, in the paſſage, which is the ſubject of our preſent inquiry. Suppoſe then that a travelling Chriſtian was known to deliver falſe

[a] See Luke ix. 52—54.

[b] The Arabic ſalutation سلام عليكم which ſignifies Peace be with you, is uſed between Mohammedans, but not between Mohammedans and Chriſtians.

falſe doctrines, or to propagate Gnoſtic errors, ſuch as this, that Jeſus was not the ſon of God, the queſtion is, Was he entitled to the hoſpitable reception uſually given to Chriſtian travellers, and was it want of charity to refuſe him admittance, unleſs his ſituation were ſuch, as rendered him an object of compaſſion? I think not: for if a miſſionary comes into my houſe, who is a falſe teacher of Chriſtianity, and I receive and protect him, I take part in the propagation of his errors.

SECT. II.

Of the time, when the ſecond and third Epiſtles of St. John were written.

THESE two Epiſtles are ſo ſimilar, both in their contents and in their expreſſions, that they appear to have been written at the ſame time, and delivered to the care of the ſame perſons, who were probably certain Chriſtians, engaged in the propagation of Chriſtianity, and then going to take a journey for that purpoſe into the country, where the perſons reſided, to whom St. John wrote. This opinion derives additional probability from the cloſe of each Epiſtle, in which St. John promiſes an early viſit, and declares that he has much more to communicate, than that which he has committed to writing.

This promiſe, if the ſecond Epiſtle was written, not to an individual but to a whole church, might induce one to ſuppoſe, that Caius, to whom the third Epiſtle is addreſſed, was a member of that church. But a careful compariſon of the two Epiſtles will ſhew, that this ſuppoſition is ungrounded. For St. John's principal object in the third Epiſtle is to recommend certain travellers to the hoſpitality of Caius: and he ſays, ver. 9. 'I wrote unto

unto the church, but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not.' Hence it appears that St. John, before he wrote to Caius, had already ſent a letter of recommendation to the church of which Caius was a member, but that Diotrephes had refuſed to receive thoſe, whom St. John had recommended. Now if this were the ſecond Epiſtle, we ſhould certainly find it in thoſe recommendations, to which St. John alludes, and probably ſome mention of Diotrephes. But in the ſecond Epiſtle no mention is made, either of Diotrephes, or of any recommendations whatſoever: conſequently it cannot be the Epiſtle, to which St. John alludes in the third[c]. However I think it probable that the place, to which the ſecond Epiſtle was ſent, was not far diſtant from the place where Caius reſided, and that the travelling brethren, whom St. John recommends to Caius, intended to viſit both places.

That theſe two Epiſtles were written at a time, when St. John was no longer young, appears from the title ὁ πρεσβυτερος, which he has given himſelf in each of them. But this title will not warrant the concluſion that he was in a very advanced age. From the time of St. Peter's death, which happened in 66, St. John was ſtrictly ſpeaking, the elder or father of the church: and even before St. Peter's death, he might have called himſelf πρεσβυτερος with the ſame propriety, as St. Peter has called himſelf συμπρεσβυτερος[d]. There is no neceſſity therefore for aſſigning to theſe Epiſtles ſo late a date as 82 or 83, as Whitby has done, and ſtill leſs, ſo very late a date as 91 or 92, which is aſſigned them by Mill. Beſides, if St. John had written theſe Epiſtles, when he was upwards of eighty, he would hardly have promiſed, as he did in each of them, that he would ſoon undertake

[c] Hence it follows that St. John wrote an Epiſtle, which is no longer extant. But ſome commentators, who will not admit, that any Epiſtle could be loſt, which was written by an Apoſtle, tranſlate εγραψα τῃ εκκλησια, 3 John 9. 'I *would* have written to the church.'

[d] 1 Pet. v. 1.

take a journey. Nor is it probable, if he had written at ſo very advanced an age, that his language would have been ſo fluent.

I once thought, that theſe two Epiſtles were written before that, which is called the firſt Epiſtle of St. John; but my reaſon for ſuppoſing ſo, appears to me at preſent to be ill-founded. I will mention it however, leſt the ſame thought ſhould occur to others.

St. John ſays in his firſt Epiſtle, ch. ii. 13. (at leaſt according to our common printed text), 'I write unto you, fathers, becauſe ye have known him, that is, from the beginning. I write unto you, young men, becauſe ye have overcome the wicked one. I write unto you little children, becauſe ye have known the Father.' Here St. John ſpeaks in the preſent tenſe; but in the next verſe he ſpeaks in the paſt time, and ſays, 'I have written unto you, fathers, becauſe ye have known him, that is, from the beginning. I have written unto you, young men, becauſe ye are ſtrong, and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one.' Now in the ſecond Epiſtle, ver. 5. there is ſomething which bears a reſemblance to that which St. John ſays he had written to the fathers: and ver. 4. contains the ſubſtance at leaſt of that, which he ſays he had written to the young men. But, as the expreſſions are different, and in the ſecond Epiſtle no diſtinction occurs between fathers and young men, as in the firſt Epiſtle, the conjecture grounded on 1 John ii. 14. reſts on a very uncertain foundation.

I am therefore unable to diſcover any marks of the time, when the two laſt Epiſtles were written: and it remains uncertain, whether they were written before or after what is called the firſt Epiſtle, and whether they were written before, or after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem.

SECT. III.

Whether the ſecond Epiſtle was ſent to a particular perſon, or to a whole church.

THE addreſs, with which the ſecond Epiſtle begins, is, 'The elder to the elect lady (εκλεκτῃ κυριᾳ), and her children.' Now the title 'elect lady' has been explained by many ancient commentators, not literally, but figuratively, and as denoting, either the whole Chriſtian church, or ſome particular Chriſtian church. The former explanation has been given by Jerom [e], the latter by Caſſiodorius. But that this Epiſtle was addreſſed to the whole Chriſtian church is utterly impoſſible, becauſe St. John promiſes at the cloſe of it that he will ſoon viſit the perſon or perſons to whom he is writing, which promiſe he could not intend to make to every Chriſtian community diſperſed throughout the Roman empire. The ſame objection does not apply to the other explanation, namely, that it was addreſſed to a particular Chriſtian church: but there are other objections, which apply equally to both. 'The elect lady, and her children,' if underſtood of a Chriſtian church and its members, is too figurative for the epiſtolary ſtyle, and though an expreſſion like this would be admiſſible perhaps in an animated prophecy, it is very ill ſuited to the plain addreſs of a letter. Beſides, when the Hebrew prophets call the Jewiſh women by the title 'daughters of Zion,' every reader perceives at once that the language is metaphorical: but when a letter begins with the addreſs, 'to the elect lady and her children,' the ſubject does not ſuggeſt a metaphor.

Moſt of the modern commentators explain εκλεκτῃ κυριᾳ literally, and underſtand the expreſſion not of a church,

[e] In his Epiſtle to Agaruchia. T. IV. p. 741. Ep. 91.

[f] In his Expoſition of this Epiſtle.

church, but of a woman. But they do not agree in their literal interpretations. Some tranſlate εκλεκτη κυριᾳ 'to the elect lady,' while others conſider either εκλεκτη or κυριᾳ as a proper name. But εκλεκτη cannot here be a proper name, for, if it were, St. John would not have written τῃ Εκλεκτῃ κυριᾳ, but τῃ κυριᾳ Εκλεκτῃ, or at leaſt, without the article Εκλεκτη κυριᾳ. Beſides, if εκλεκτη ver. 1. be conſidered as a proper name, the ſame word ver. 13. which is applied to this lady's ſiſter muſt likewiſe be explained as a proper name, and then we ſhall have two ſiſters, each of which had the unuſual name of Electa. The opinion, that Κυρια is a proper name, is not attended with the ſame grammatical difficulty: and it has this circumſtance in its favour, that Κυρια is rendered as a proper name in the Syriac and Arabic verſions[s].

Yet the opinion, that this Epiſtle was addreſſed to a woman, is likewiſe attended with ſome difficulties, which, though when taken ſingly they are not of ſufficient importance to overturn it, are of ſome weight, at leaſt as they appear to me, when taken together. St. John ſays, ver. 5. ερωτω σε, κυρια,—ἱνα αγαπωμεν αλληλους. It is true that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of Chriſtian love and charity, and that no ſerious man, on reading this paſſage, will think of any other kind of love, eſpecially, as neither the writer of the Epiſtle, nor the perſon to whom it was written, (if written to a woman) were any longer young. But I think that, if St. John had written really to a woman, he would have avoided an expreſſion, which they, who are accuſtomed to treat grave ſubjects ludicrouſly, might convert into ridicule. Further, it is extraordinary, that St. John ſhould ſpeak ver. 1. of 'the elect lady, and her children,' and ver. 13. of 'the children of her elect ſiſter,' and yet ſay nothing of either of their huſbands. However I will not inſiſt on this objection becauſe both of them might have been widows. Again, St.

[s] The word is retained and written in Syriac ܟܘܪܝܐ, in Arabic كوريا, and in the Arabic of Erpenius كيريا.

St. John not only greets the children of the elect lady, who were then with her, but ſpeaks likewiſe, ver. 4. of ſeveral other of her children, whom he 'found walking in the truth.' This implies, that her children were very numerous. Laſtly, St. John ſpeaks of her children, as if they were all of them ſons, and ſays nothing of daughters. For, though he uſes both ver. 1. and ver. 4. the neuter τεκνα, which when uſed by itſelf may include daughters as well as ſons, yet, ſince he adds in the former inſtance ὁς εγω αγαπω, and in the latter inſtance περιπατεντας εν αληθειᾳ, the maſculine relative and participle reſtrict the ſenſe to ſons alone [h]. Now in a numerous family, it is very ſeldom that we find all ſons, and no daughters: but when we ſpeak of a church the word 'ſons' includes perſons of both ſexes.

It appears then, that the literal interpretation of εκλεκτη κυριᾳ is attended with difficulty, as well as its metaphorical interpretation. I would explain therefore this expreſſion elliptically, by which means it may be made to denote a church, as well as by its metaphorical interpretation; and at the ſame time the inconvenience attending the metaphor will be avoided. I conjecture that κυριᾳ is uſed elliptically for κυριᾳ εκκλησια, which among the ancient Greeks ſignified an aſſembly of the people held at a ſtated time, and at Athens was held three times in every month [i]. Now ſince the ſacred writers adopted the term εκκλησια from its civil uſe among the Greeks, κυριᾳ εκκλησια, if uſed in the ſacred writings would ſignify the ſtated aſſembly of the Chriſtians held every Sunday: and τῃ εκλεκτῃ κυριᾳ, with εκκλησιᾳ underſtood, would ſignify 'to the elect church or community, which comes together on Sundays.' The only difficulty attending this interpretation is, that I know of no inſtance, in which εκκλησια, as belonging to κυριᾳ, is ſuppreſſed.

[h] St. John here uſes what is called conſtructio ad ſenſum.

[i] See Suidas, under the article εκκλησια κυριᾳ.

SECT. IV.

Of the contents and deſign of the third Epiſtle.

THE object of the third Epiſtle was to recommend to Caius, certain Chriſtians, who were travelling to preach the Goſpel to the heathens; and St. John wrote to Caius in particular, becauſe his hoſpitality to the Chriſtian brethren was already known, and St. John had reaſon to apprehend, that a former Epiſtle, which he had addreſſed to the community, of which Caius was a member, had produced little effect.

The recommendation is properly contained in the ſixth, ſeventh, and eighth verſes. In the ſixth verſe, St. John ſays to Caius, thou will do well (καλῶς ποιησεις [k]) if thou forwardeſt the brethren on their journey. Theſe brethren he deſcribes in the ſeventh verſe, as perſons, who 'went forth for God's ſake, taking nothing of the Gentiles.' Now whether theſe perſons went forth voluntarily to preach the Goſpel to the Gentiles, and would not receive from them any reward for their labours, or whether they had been compelled by a perſecution to quit their own country, and refuſed to accept alms in their diſtreſs from benevolent heathens, is a queſtion, on which the commentators are not agreed. But the former is the moſt probable, becauſe it is attended with no inconvenience, whereas to the latter may be made the three following objections.

1. In the age, in which this Epiſtle was written, there were very few exiles for the ſake of the Goſpel, eſpecially in Grecian countries. And if any Chriſtians had been baniſhed from Epheſus, St. John himſelf, as the principal perſon, muſt likewiſe have been baniſhed.

2. If

[k] The expreſſion καλως ποιησεις denotes a civil requeſt, and is equivalent to, 'I intreat thee' See 1 Maccab. xi. 43. xii. 18. 22. At any rate, as St. John here uſes the future tenſe, he muſt mean ſome expected, and not any paſt act of hoſpitality.

2. If the perſons, whom St. John recommended, had been exiles, he would not have requeſted Caius to ſhew them a mere temporary hoſpitality, and then forward them on their way. To exiles, who ſtand in need of pecuniary aſſiſtance, we render very little ſervice by ſupplying them with the means of travelling further: for whither at laſt are they to travel? The greateſt favour which we can beſtow on ſuch perſons is to procure for them employment in the place where they are, and thus enable them to provide for themſelves.

3. It appears from ver. 7. that the perſons, whom St. John recommended, would accept of no preſent from an heathen. Now an exile in diſtreſs, who carries his religious hatred ſo far, as to reject the benevolent offers of thoſe, who entertain different ſentiments from himſelf, is entitled to no commiſeration. Such a man, if he had it in his power, would be the moſt intolerant perſecutor: and therefore every favour conferred on him is an ill beſtowed act of liberality, ſince it confirms him in his hatred of all thoſe who have a different religion. A man of this deſcription muſt be left to himſelf, till poverty and hunger have brought him to his ſenſes, and have changed the imaginary ſaint into a rational being.

In the 12th verſe St. John highly commends Demetrius, ſaying, 'Demetrius hath good report of all men, and of the truth itſelf: yea, and we alſo bear record, and ye know, that our record is true.' Now whether this Demetrius was one of the travellers, whom the Apoſtle recommended, or whether he lived in the ſame place with Caius, is uncertain. But the former is the moſt probable, for in the latter caſe, he muſt have been well known to Caius, and therefore St. John would not have thought it neceſſary to bear witneſs to his good character.

In the Chriſtian community, of which Caius was a member, there was a perſon, called Diotrephes, who aſſumed to himſelf very great authority. Whether he was orthodox, or an heretic, whether a biſhop or a deacon, whether a Jewiſh or an heathen convert, it is wholly

wholly impoſſible to determine, for we know no more about him, than what is mentioned in this Epiſtle. It is uſeleſs therefore to form any conjecture, ſince we have no ground, on which either this or that ſuppoſition can be built. Equally uncertain is it, what his motive was for objecting to the reception of the Chriſtian travellers whom St. John had recommended: whether he diſapproved of their doctrine, or whether he was inimical to them, as being heathen converts, or according to the opinion of others, as being Jewiſh converts, or whether, as Heumann ſuppoſes, he objected to their entertainment, on account of the impoveriſhed ſtate of the public cheſt. We have no foundation for any one of theſe ſuppoſitions: and, if I chooſe to indulge conjecture, I could augment the liſt by as many more, for inſtance, that Diotrephes was afraid the Chriſtians might incur the diſpleaſure of the magiſtrates, by the reception of miſſionaries, or that the miſſionaries themſelves were ill choſen, or that the heathens, to whom they preached, and not the Chriſtians, ſhould provide for their ſubſiſtence, or laſtly, that Diotrephes himſelf delivered falſe doctrines, and therefore objected to thoſe, who propagated the true faith. This laſt conjecture is the moſt ſpecious, and beſt accords with the contents of the Epiſtle. Yet, as we have a total want of hiſtorical information on this ſubject, it is better to confeſs our ignorance, than to pretend to know, what we really do not.

Of this Diotrephes, St. John ſays ver. ουτε αυτος επιδεχεται τους αδελφους, και τους βουλομενους κωλυει, και εκ της εκκλησιας εκβαλλει. Some commentators ſupply τους αδελφους after εκβαλλει, and underſtand that Diotrephes ejected the travelling brethren from the church: but others, who I think are in the right, conſtrue εκβαλλει with τους βουλομενους, and underſtand that Diotrephes ejected thoſe who wiſhed to receive and entertain the travelling brethren. However, it does not thence follow, that he was a biſhop: for biſhops at that time had not the power of excommunication, which was veſted in the community at large.

The acts of authority which Diotrephes exerciſed muſt be aſcribed either to his rank, or his wealth, or his eloquence, or ſome other cauſe, by which he gained the majority of voices, and thus effected his purpoſe.

But if Diotrephes had ſufficient influence in the community of which he was a member, to procure the ejection of thoſe who received ſtrangers, it is ſaid, that Caius, who was remarkable for his hoſpitality, would hardly have been ſpared. Yet Caius does not appear in this Epiſtle, as a perſon who had been excommunicated. To this I anſwer, that, though Diotrephes might have ſufficient influence to procure the ejection of ſeveral members, it does not therefore follow, that he was able to procure the ejection of every hoſpitable member, eſpecially of thoſe, who were particularly loved and reſpected, as Caius probably was. At any rate, I cannot agree with thoſe commentators, who, to avoid this ſeeming difficulty, conſtrue εκβαλλει with αδελφους: for the travelling brethren, who wiſhed to be received and entertained in that community, were not yet members of it, and therefore it cannot be ſaid, that they were expelled from it. The expreſſion εκβαλλει εκ της πολεως would have ſuited them, but not εκβαλλει εκ της εκκλησιας, which is applicable only to thoſe, who were actual members of that church.

SECT. V.

Of the perſon of Caius, to whom the third Epiſtle is addreſſed.

SEVERAL perſons of the name of Caius occur in the New Teſtament.

1. In the Epiſtle to the Romans, ch. xvi. 23. St. Paul mentions a Caius who lived at Corinth, and whom

St. Paul calls 'his hoſt, and the hoſt of the whole church.'

2. In the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, ch. i. 14. St. Paul likewiſe mentions a Caius, who lived at Corinth, and who had been baptized by St. Paul. This is probably the ſame perſon with the preceding.

3. In the Acts of the Apoſtles, ch. xix. 29. is mentioned a Caius, who was a native of Macedonia, who accompanied St. Paul, and ſpent ſome time with him at Epheſus. This is probably a different perſon from the preceding: for the deſcription given of the Caius, who lived in Corinth, and was the hoſt of the whole church there, does not accord with the deſcription given of the Macedonian Caius, who in the very ſame year travelled with St. Paul, and was with him at Epheſus.

4. In Acts xx. 4. we meet a Caius of Derbe, who was likewiſe a fellow traveller of St. Paul. This perſon cannot well be the Corinthian Caius, for the hoſt of the whole church at Corinth hardly left the place to travel into Aſia. And he is clearly diſtinguiſhed from the Macedonia Caius by the epithet Δερβαιος.

Now whether the Caius to whom St. John wrote his third Epiſtle, was one of the perſons juſt mentioned, or whether he was different from them all, it is at preſent difficult to determine, becauſe Caius was a very common name. Yet if we may judge from the ſimilarity of character, it is not improbable that he was the Caius, who lived at Corinth, and who is called by St. Paul 'the hoſt of the whole church:' for hoſpitality to his Chriſtian brethren was the leading feature in the character of that Caius, to whom St. John wrote, and on that very account he is commended by the Apoſtle. Further, St. John's friend lived in a place, where the Apoſtle had in Diotrephes a very ambitious and tyrannical adverſary: and that there were men of this deſcription at Corinth, is evident from the two Epiſtles to the Corinthians, though St. Paul has not mentioned their names.

If the third Epiſtle of St. John was really ſent to Corinth, the ſecond Epiſtle muſt have been ſent to ſome

place in the neighbourhood of Corinth, or even to Corinth itſelf, ſince the miſſionaries did not intend to preach in the community, but to travel further[1].

Perhaps, the thought will ſuggeſt itſelf, that the brethren who were gone forth to preach the Goſpel, and would accept of nothing from the Gentiles were St. Paul and his companions; for they acted in this manner at Corinth. But this is not probable, becauſe ſo remarkable a brother as St. Paul would have been mentioned in this Epiſtle by name, if he had really been one of them. Beſides, St. Paul did not accept of any preſent, even from the Chriſtians at Corinth.

Laſtly, St. John promiſes Caius at the cloſe of the Epiſtle, that he will ſhortly come to viſit him. It is true, that in the eccleſiaſtical annals of the firſt century no journey or voyage of St. John to Corinth is now on record. But we muſt not therefore conclude that he never was there; for we hardly know any thing of the travels of any other of the Apoſtles than St. Paul, and conſequently can draw no concluſion from the ſilence of their hiſtory. We know that St. John lived during a conſiderable time at Epheſus: and ſince Corinth lay almoſt oppoſite to Epheſus, and St. John from his former occupation, before he became Apoſtle, was accuſtomed to the ſea, it is not improbable that the journey, or voyage, which he propoſed to make, was by ſea from Epheſus to Corinth.

[1] Ver. 6. ὡς καλως ποιησεις προπεμψας.

CHAP. XXXIII.

OF THE APOCALYPSE.

SECT. I.

Previous apology for the author's uncertainty, in reſpect to the Apocalypſe.

I COME now to an important, but at the ſame time the moſt difficult and the moſt doubtful book in the whole New Teſtament. The various queſtions, which here preſent themſelves for examination, whether they relate to the ſtyle of the Apocalypſe, or the year in which it was publiſhed, or the qualifications, which every man muſt neceſſarily poſſeſs, who attempts to expound it, depend entirely on the main queſtion, whether it is a genuine work of St. John the Evangeliſt, or not. And on the main queſtion I candidly confeſs, that I have not been able to obtain that certainty, which I have obtained in reſpect to other books of the New Teſtament: conſequently I ſhall be frequently obliged to ſpeak of the dependent queſtions in a manner merely conditional and hypothetical. In the whole of this inquiry therefore I will accompany the reader as far as I think we can go with ſafety: I will point out to him likewiſe all the proſpects which lie before him; but when we are arrived at the place, where the path divides, I ſhall think proper to halt, and leave it to his own choice to take that road, which appears to him the beſt.

As it is not improbable, that this cautious method of proceeding will give offence to ſome of my readers, I muſt plead in my behalf the example of Luther, who thought and acted preciſely in the ſame manner. His ſentiments on this ſubject are delivered, not in an occaſional diſſertation on the Apocalypſe, but in the preface

to

to his German tranſlation of it, a tranſlation deſigned not merely for the learned, but for the illiterate, and even for children. In the preface prefixed to that edition, which was printed in 1522, he expreſſed himſelf in very ſtrong terms [m]: but in that which he printed in 1534, he uſed milder and leſs deciſive expreſſions. Still however he declared, he was not convinced that the Apocalypſe was canonical, and recommended the interpretation of it to thoſe, who were more enlightened than himſelf [n]. If Luther then, the author of our reformation,

[m] In this preface he ſays: 'In this book of the Revelation of St. John, I leave it to every man to judge for himſelf: I will bind no man to my fancy or opinion: I ſay only what I feel. Not one thing only fails in this book, ſo that I hold it neither for apoſtolical, nor prophetical. Firſt and chiefly, the Apoſtles do not propheſy in viſions, but in clear and plain words, as St. Peter, St. Paul, and Chriſt in the Goſpel do: it is moreover the Apoſtle's duty to ſpeak of Chriſt and his actions in a ſimple way, not in figures and viſions. Alſo no prophet of the Old Teſtament, much leſs of the New, has ſo treated throughout his whole book of nothing but viſions: ſo that I put it almoſt in the ſame rank with the fourth book of Eſdras, and cannot any way find that it was dictated by the Holy Ghoſt. Beſides, I think it too much, that in his own book, more than in any other of the holy books, which are of much greater importance, he commands and threatens, that, if any man ſhall take away from the words of this book, God ſhall take away his part out of the book of life; and moreover declares, that he who keepeth the words of this book, ſhall be bleſſed, though no one is able to underſtand what they are, much leſs to keep them: alſo there are much nobler books, the words of which we have to keep. In former times likewiſe many of the fathers rejected this book, though St. Jerom talks in high words, and ſays it is above all praiſe, and that there is much myſtery therein. Laſtly, let every one think of it what his own ſpirit ſuggeſts. My ſpirit can make nothing out of this book; and I have reaſon enough not to eſteem it highly, ſince Chriſt is not taught in it, which an Apoſtle is above all things bound to do, as he ſays, Acts i. ye ſhall be my witneſſes. Therefore I abide by the books which teach Chriſt clearly and purely.'

[n] In the preface to the edition printed in 1534, he divides prophecies into three claſſes, the third of which contains viſions, without explanations of them, and of theſe he ſays: 'As long as a prophecy remains unexplained and has no determinate interpretation, it is a hidden ſilent prophecy, and is deſtitute of the advantages, which it ought to afford to Chriſtians. This has hitherto happened to the Apocalypſe: for though many have made the attempt, no one to the preſent

tion, thought and acted in this manner, and the divines of the two laſt centuries ſtill continued, without incurring the charge of hereſy, to print Luther's preface to the Apocalypſe, in the editions of the German Bible of which they had the ſuperintendence, ſurely no one of the preſent age ought to cenſure a writer for the avowal of ſimilar doubts. Should it be objected, that what was excuſable in Luther would be inexcuſable in a modern divine, ſince more light has been thrown on the ſubject than there had been in the ſixteenth century, I would aſk in what this light conſiſts. If it conſiſts in newly diſcovered teſtimonies of the ancients, they are rather unfavourable to the cauſe: for the canon of the Syrian church, which was not known in Europe, when Luther wrote, decides againſt it. On the other hand, if this light conſiſts in a more clear and determinate explanation of the prophecies contained in the Apocalypſe, which later commentators have been able to make out by the aid of hiſtory, I would venture to appeal to a ſynod of the lateſt and moſt zealous interpreters of it, ſuch as Vitringa, Lange, Oporin, Heumann, and Bengel, names which are free from all ſuſpicion, and I have not the leaſt doubt that at every interpretation, which I pronounced unſatisfactory, I ſhould have at leaſt three voices out of the five in my favour, At all events they would never be unanimous againſt me, in the places where I declared that I was unable to perceive the new light, which is ſuppoſed to have been thrown on the ſubject ſince the time of Luther.

I admit that Luther uſes too harſh expreſſions, where he ſpeaks of the Epiſtle of St. James, though in a preface

preſent day has brought any thing certain out of it, but ſeveral have made incoherent ſtuff out of their own brain. On account of theſe uncertain interpretations, and hidden ſenſes, we have hitherto left it to itſelf, eſpecially ſince ſome of the ancient fathers believed that it was not wrtiten by the Apoſtle, as is related in Lib. III. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *In this uncertainty we for our part ſtill let it remain: but do not prevent others from taking it to be the work of St. John the Apoſtle, if they chooſe. And becauſe I ſhould be glad to ſee a certain interpretation of it, I will afford to other and higher ſpirits occaſion to reflect.*

preface not deſigned for Chriſtians of every denomination: but his opinion of the Apocalypſe is delivered in terms of the utmoſt diffidence, which are well worthy of imitation. And this is ſo much the more laudable as the Apocalypſe is a book, which Luther's oppoſition to the church of Rome muſt have rendered highly acceptable to him, unleſs he had thought impartially and had refuſed to ſacrifice his own doubts to polemical conſiderations.

Before I proceed in this inquiry, I think proper to acknowledge, that in the following introduction to the Apocalypſe I have derived ſeveral important remarks from a treatiſe, which was communicated to me in manuſcript, bearing the following title, Diſcours hiſtorique et critique ſur l' Apocalypſe par Mr. d' A—t *. The author of this treatiſe is indeed ſometimes too ſevere in his cenſure of the fathers, and conducts the controverſy in a tone, which is too ſatirical: yet it cannot be denied that the objections, which he has made to the Apocalypſe, are of great importance. I have likewiſe made uſe of a compoſition delivered to me by one of my former pupils, when he quitted the univerſity, whoſe name however I have not the liberty to mention, containing various doubts reſpecting the Apocalypſe, with a requeſt that, if poſſible, I would remove them. In the removal of ſome them I have been ſucceſsful, though not in the removal of them all: but, as notice will be taken of them in the following ſections, perhaps other critics will be able to anſwer what lies not within my power.

* Mr. D'Abaugit, Public Librarian at Geneva.

SECT. II.

Teſtimonies of the earlieſt eccleſiaſtical writers, both for and againſt the Apocalypſe.

EUSEBIUS, whom I mention firſt, becauſe he is the principal ancient writer, who has collected accounts of the Canon, expreſſes himſelf, after having mentioned the unqueſtionable books of the New Teſtament, namely, the four Goſpels, the Acts of the Apoſtles, the Epiſtles of St. Paul, the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter, and the firſt Epiſtle of St. John, in the following manner with reſpect to the Apocalypſe. 'To theſe may be added, if one chooſes, the Revelation of St. John, on which I ſhall mention the opinions of the ancients in their proper places. And theſe are the Homologoumena[p].' He afterwards adds a liſt of the ſpurious books (νοθα) of the New Teſtament, as the Hiſtory of Paul, the Shepherd, the Revelation of Peter, &c. which he diſtinguiſhes from an intermediate claſs containing books of only doubtful authority: and this claſs of ſpurious books he cloſes with the following words. 'Further, if one chooſes, the Revelation of St. John, which, as I have ſaid, ſome reject, others reckon among the Homologoumena[q].' It appears then, that Euſebius, after all his inquiries into the Canon, had not been able to diſcover any thing deciſive in reſpect to the Apocalypſe, and conſequently remained in doubt. But there is another paſſage in his Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory[r], where he ſeems to deliver his own opinion, and in which he comes more to the point. In this paſſage, after having ſhewn from the writings

[p] Hiſt. Eccles. Lib. III. cap. 25.

[q] The whole paſſage, which is ſomewhat obſcure, I have already quoted at length in Vol. III. ch. iv. ſect. 9. of this Introduction.

[r] Lib. III. cap. 39.

writings of Papias, that beſide St. John the Apoſtle, there lived at Epheſus a Preſbyter of the ſame name, he adds: 'This latter John was probably the perſon who ſaw the Revelation, unleſs it be inſiſted on, that it was the former.' Upon the whole therefore Euſebius, who had not been able to obtain any hiſtorical certainty on this ſubject, took a middle road, and neither pronounced it a forgery, nor aſcribed it to St. John the Apoſtle.

It is not to be expected, that we in the preſent age ſhould be able to obtain the teſtimony of a greater number of ancient witneſſes in reſpect to the Apocalypſe than this firſt and great collector of materials for eccleſiaſtical hiſtory: and in general we muſt reſt ſatisfied with the minutes, which he has taken. But as various circumſtances may appear to us to be more deciſive, than they did to Euſebius, and it is better, wherever we can, to examine for ourſelves, than to truſt to the report of others, we will inquire into the evidence of eccleſiaſtical writers prior to the time of Euſebius, who have either received the Apocalypſe, or have openly rejected it, or have paſſed it over in ſuch ſilence, that their ſilence amounts to a rejection of it.

The moſt ancient evidence, and who belongs perhaps to the laſt mentioned claſs of writers, is Ignatius. For he wrote Epiſtles to the Chriſtian communities at Epheſus, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, which are three of the ſeven churches, to which the ſeven Epiſtles in the book of Revelation are addreſſed in the name of Chriſt. Yet Ignatius, though he particularly reminds the Epheſians of the praiſes beſtowed on them by St. Paul, is totally ſilent both in his Epiſtle to the church of Epheſus, and his Epiſtles to the churches of Smyrna and Philadelphia, of the praiſes, which according to Rev. ii. 1—7, 8—11, iii. 7—12. their biſhops had received from Chriſt himſelf. Under theſe circumſtances may we not conclude, either that the Apocalypſe was unknown to Ignatius, or that, if it was known to him, he did not believe it to be genuine? And may we not likewiſe

likewiſe infer, that if it was a genuine work of St. John the Apoſtle, it could not have remained unknown to Ignatius[s]?

The old Syriac tranſlator, whom I mention immediately after Ignatius, becauſe in my opinion he lived in the firſt century, did not tranſlate the Apocalypſe: conſequently, he either knew nothing of it, or did not believe it to be genuine. It is true, that the Apocalypſe was afterwards tranſlated into Syriac[t]: but it never was admitted into the Peſhito, or Syriac Vulgate, which forms the Canon of the Syrian church.

Papias, who is repreſented by Euſebius as a man of great credulity, would be an evidence of the utmoſt importance againſt the Apocalypſe, if it could be clearly and indiſputably proved, that he had never quoted it. For his very credulity, how great ſoever it might have been, would, in caſe he rejected the Apocalypſe, increaſe the weight of his teſtimony. Papias, who lived in the beginning of the ſecond century, was, as is well known, the founder of the Millennarian ſyſtem among the orthodox[u]. His opinion was, that after the general reſurrection, Chriſt would reign upon earth a thouſand years with the faithful: and it was this opinion, which induced Euſebius to aſcribe to him the character of credulity[x]. Now it is certain, that in not any one book of the whole Bible the doctrine of the Millennium is taught in expreſs terms, though many Millennarians have pretended, that ſeveral of the ancient prophets have ſpoken of it. But in the Apocalypſe, and the Apocalypſe alone, this doctrine is diſcoverable, if we take all the expreſſions uſed in the twentieth chapter in a ſtrictly

[s] Knittel has endeavoured to obviate the force of this objection, in his Criticiſms on the Revelation of St. John, p. 15. to which place I refer the reader.

[t] See Vol. II. ch. vii. ſect. 10. of this Introduction.

[u] A very full account of Papias is given by Euſebius, Hiſt. Eccles. Lib. iii. cap. 39.

[x] See what I have ſaid on this ſubject, Vol. III. ch. iv. ſect. 4.

ſtrictly literal ſenſe: and this is the chapter on which all the Millennarians of modern ages have principally grounded their opinions. If then Papias, the father of the Millennarians, who made it likewiſe his particular buſineſs, to inquire into what had been ſaid and done by the Apoſtles, has never quoted the Apocalypſe, this ſilence muſt imply, that at the beginning of the ſecond century the Apocalypſe was unknown in Aſia Minor, which is equivalent to its not then exiſting. For Papias was biſhop of Hierapolis, a town not far from Laodicea, to the angel of which church one of the ſeven apocalyptical Epiſtles was addreſſed. Could then this prophetical book have remained unknown to him, if it had then exiſted? And if he had known it, would he have rejected a work, which would have been the beſt ſupport of his favourite doctrine? And would not his very credulity have contributed to his acceptance of it, without ſufficient examination of it, even though it had not been genuine.

If Papias then never quoted the Apocalypſe, I do not ſee in what manner its authenticity can be defended. However, that he never did quote it is not quite ſo certain, as ſome critics have ſuppoſed, though every one, who reads the account given by Euſebius, will naturally draw this concluſion, and for the two following reaſons.

1. After Euſebius has ſhewn from the writings of Papias, that beſide St. John the Apoſtle there lived at Epheſus a Preſbyter of the ſame name, he hazards a conjecture of his own, that this John the Preſbyter was the perſon who ſaw the Revelation. Conſequently Euſebius found in the writings of Papias this opinion neither aſſerted nor contradicted. But it is very extraordinary, that Papias, who made it his particular buſineſs to inquire of the elder Chriſtians into every thing, which had been ſaid and done by the Apoſtles, and who eſpecially noted the difference between John the Apoſtle, and John the Preſbyter, ſhould have left wholly unnoticed, which of theſe two perſons ſaw the Revelation, if the book itſelf had been known to him.

2. Euſebius

2. Euſebius repreſents Papias as grounding his doctrine of the Millennium, not on the Bible, but on certain expreſſions of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, handed down by oral tradition, which Papias underſtood in a too literal ſenſe. But if Papias had been acquainted with the Apocalypſe, he could have been under no neceſſity of having recourſe to oral tradition, ſince the twentieth chapter of this book, when literally interpreted, would have much better ſuited his purpoſe. The words which Euſebius has uſed on this occaſion are as follow. 'This writer (Papias) has mentioned ſeveral things, which he ſays, he learnt by oral tradition, ſuch as parables and doctrines of our Saviour not contained in the Goſpels, and alſo ſome things, which are fabulous. Among theſe may be reckoned the aſſertion, that, after the reſurrection of the dead, Chriſt will reign in perſon a thouſand years on earth. I ſuppoſe, that he acquired this notion from his inquiring into the ſayings of the Apoſtles, and his not underſtanding what they had delivered figuratively.'

On the other hand, if we may credit the account given by Andrew, biſhop of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, in the fifth century, Papias gave even teſtimony in favour of the Apocalypſe. For Andrew ſays expreſsly in the preface to his commentary on the Apocalypſe: 'Of the divine inſpiration of this book I need not treat at large, ſince ſo many holy men, Gregory the divine, Cyril, and before them, Papias, Irenæus, and Hippolitus have given their teſtimony to it.'

To reconcile theſe two contradictory accounts, we muſt aſſume, either, that Andrew conſidered Papias's defence of the Millennium as a virtual ſupport of the Apocalypſe, and that he therefore haſtily aſſerted that Papias had borne teſtimony to this book, or that Euſebius had not read with ſufficient attention the writings of Papias, for whom he had no great reſpect, and that he overlooked thoſe paſſages, in which Papias perhaps quoted the Apocalypſe in ſupport of his millennarian principles. Either of theſe caſes is poſſible: but which is the true one, it is impoſ-

ſible to determine with abſolute certainty, as the writings of Papias are no longer extant. It will appear however from what will be ſaid in the fourth ſection of this chapter relative to Gregory of Nazianzum, that the error is probably on the ſide of Andrew. If Papias really knew and received the Apocalypſe, he is by no means an important witneſs in its favour, becauſe it is a book, to which his millennarian principles muſt have made him partial: if he knew it not, or if he had received it not, he is a deciſive evidence againſt it. If he knew it not, it could not have been written even by John the Preſbyter: but on the other hand, this will afford no argument in favour of the opinion, which ſome have maintained, that the Apocalypſe was a forgery of Cerinthus: for if Cerinthus had been the author of it, Papias would undoubtedly have heard of it. The only inference to be deduced from Papias's total want of knowledge of it, would be, that it was forged by ſome unknown perſon about the year 120, between the time when Papias wrote, and the time when Juſtin Martyr wrote, for the latter was well acquainted with it, and received it alſo as a ſacred work.

The words, in which Juſtin Martyr ſpeaks of the Apocalypſe, are the following[y]. 'A man among us, whoſe name was John, one of the Apoſtles of Chriſt, has in a Revelation, which was made to him, propheſied that the faithful in Chriſt ſhall live a thouſand years in Jeruſalem, and that afterwards the general and eternal reſurrection and judgment of all men ſhall follow.'

Melito, who lived about the year 170, wrote a treatiſe entitled, 'On the devil, and the Revelation of St. John[z].' Euſebius indeed does not declare whether Melito wrote for or againſt the Apocalypſe, and it is not impoſſible, that Melito, as ſome other ancient writers have done, wrote in order to confute it. But as I think it not improbable, that this laſt work was an explanation of the viſions in the Apocalypſe, I reckon Melito among the witneſſes in its favour.

Irenæus

[y] Page 308. of the Cologne edition.

[z] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccles. Lib. iv. cap. 26.

Irenæus undoubtedly received the Apocalypſe as a genuine work of St. John the Apoſtle; and likewiſe aſſerted, at leaſt according to the common interpretation of his words, that the viſions were ſeen by St. John, in the reign of Domitian[a]. This laſt aſſertion would, in my opinion, extremely weaken the teſtimony of Irenæus, becauſe for reaſons, which will be delivered hereafter, the Apocalypſe can hardly be a canonical work, if it was written ſo late as the time of Domitian. But according to the very probable explanation, which Knittel, in his Criticiſms on the Revelation of St. John, has given of this paſſage of Irenæus, the objection falls to the ground. Indeed the whole teſtimony of Irenæus in favour of the Apocalypſe has been placed by Knittel in ſo very advantageous a light, that I muſt recommend to my readers, to conſult what he has ſaid on this ſubject, though he has advanced ſeveral opinions, which are directed againſt thoſe, which I myſelf have ſupported.

From the writings of Athenagoras[b], the Teſtament of the twelve Patriarchs[c], as it is called, and the Clementine Recognitions[d], Lardner has produced ſingle alluſions to the Apocalypſe, which prove that the authors of thoſe books were acquainted with it, but do not warrant the concluſion that they conſidered it, as a genuine work of St. John the Apoſtle. On the other hand, it was undoubtedly received as ſuch by Theophilus of Antioch[e], Clement of Alexandria[f], and Tertullian[g]: and with their evidence ends the ſecond century.

But in the ſame century there exiſted a ſect, called the Alogi, who were acquainted with the Apocalypſe, yet denied that it was genuine[h]. It is true, that a contradiction

[a] Lardner, Vol. II. B. I. p. 277, 278. 304.
[b] Ib. p. 338.
[c] Ib. p. 653, 654.
[d] Ib. p. 677.
[e] Ib. p. 366.
[f] Ib. p. 423,
[g] Ib. p. 523.

[h] On this ſubject the reader will find much valuable information in Körner's diſſertation entitled, De Auctoritate canonica Apocalypſeos ab Alogis impugnata et ab Epiphanio defenſa, publiſhed at Leipzig in 1751.

tradiction on the part of the Alogi, who out of mere antipathy to the word Λογος, the name of Chriſt's divine nature, rejected the unqueſtionably genuine Goſpel of St. John, and abſurdly aſcribed it to Cerinthus, is in itſelf of no great importance: nor was the eſtimation, in which they were held by their contemporaries, ſufficient to inſpire much reſpect for them, in a critic of the preſent age. Beſides, as appears from the accounts, which Epiphanius has given of them in his fifty-firſt Hereſy, they appealed not to external but to internal evidence, on which we are as well able to decide as they. One of their objections however, which is of an hiſtorical kind, is more deſerving of conſideration. The fourth Epiſtle in the Apocalypſe, ch. ii. 18—29. is addreſſed to the Angel of the church at Thyatira: and the Alogi declared, that there exiſted no church at Thyatira. This objection of the Alogi Epiphanius has delivered in the following words, και ουκ εστι εκει εκκλησια χριστιανων. But theſe words are ambiguous: for they may denote, either that there was no Chriſtian community at Thyatira, in the time of St. John, or no Chriſtian community there, when the Alogi made their objections. If we aſcribe to them the latter ſenſe, the argument is of no importance; for if there was no church or Chriſtian community at Thyatira in the middle of the ſecond century, there might have been a Chriſtian community there in the reign of Claudius, to which period Epiphanius refers the Apocalypſe. But Mr. Merkel obſerves[1] that the Alogi could not well intend to ſay, that there was no Chriſtian community at Thyatira in their own time: for there exiſted at Thyatira a com-

1751: and in Merkel's hiſtorical and critical expoſition of the controverſies of the Alogi, and other writers on the Apocalypſe in the ſecond century, intended as an additional proof that the Apocalypſe is a forgery. Leipzig 1782.

[1] Page 74—98. Mr. Merkel here treats at large of the ſtrange anſwer given by Epiphanius to this objection of the Alogi: but I have not here ſufficient room to make an extract from it. It muſt be admitted however that the anſwer of Epiphanius is very confuſed and uncritical, like moſt of the other replies, which he has made to the heretics.

a community of Alogi, who certainly conſidered themſelves as Chriſtians, and likewiſe another ſect, who were oppoſed to the Alogi, and were called Phrygians. He further obſerves, that this objection has ſo much the greater weight, as it proceeds from the Alogi, becauſe ſo many of this ſect lived at Thyatira, that they muſt be ſuppoſed to have been well acquainted with the ſtate of Chriſtianity in that place. Now I grant that the argument is of ſome weight, but I do not admit that it is abſolutely deciſive. For, if the Alogi really aſſerted, that there was no Church at Thyatira, in the time of Claudius, it is ſtill poſſible that they were miſtaken in this aſſertion. There might have been a church at Thyatira in the time of Claudius, this church might have been of ſhort duration, and have been diſſolved, before any eccleſiaſtical accounts were committed to writing, to which the Alogi had acceſs. Very few accounts are on record of the earlieſt ages of Chriſtianity.

Further, the Alogi themſelves have weakened their own cauſe by puſhing their objection further, than it can poſſibly go: for they went ſo far as to aſcribe the Apocalypſe to Cerinthus. This is manifeſtly falſe: for Cerinthus, who made a diſtinction between the Supreme Being and the Creator of the Univerſe, would never have made the four and twenty elders, Rev. iv. 11. addreſs the Supreme Being in the following words, 'Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou haſt created all things, and for thy pleaſure, they are, and were created.' Nor would he have made the angel, who ſtood upon the ſea and upon the earth, Rev. x. 6. ſwear 'by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things, that therein are, and the earth, and the things, that are therein, and the ſea, and the things, which are therein.' Nor would he have put into the mouth of another angel, Rev. xiv. 7. the words, 'Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come; and worſhip him that made heaven and earth,

and the ſea, and the fountains of waters.' Laſtly, it is not probable that Cerinthus, if he had forged the Apocalypſe in the name of St. John, would have made St. John write, Rev. ii. 2. 'Thou haſt tried them, which ſay, they are Apoſtles, and are not, and haſt found them liars,' without at leaſt inſerting ſome ſaving clauſe for himſelf. For as St. John and Cerinthus were declared adverſaries, ſuch a general deſcription proceeding from the former, muſt neceſſarily include the latter.

Mr. Körner likewiſe remarks (§ 26) that Cerinthus, who conſidered Jeſus as a mere man, would not have given to our Saviour the titles, which are applied to him in the Apocalypſe, ſuch as 'the prince of the kings of the earth' ch. i. 5. 'the beginning and the ending, the Almighty' ch. i. 8. and 'the firſt and the laſt' ch. i. 11. But in this reſpect I am not wholly of Mr. Körner's opinion: for though Cerinthus conſidered Jeſus as a man born in the natural way, yet he might have applied to our Saviour after he was raiſed to glory, the title of 'prince of the kings of the earth,' without doing any violence to his own ſyſtem, ſince this title does not neceſſarily denote the Supreme Being. The title 'Almighty' ver 8. is in the Greek παντοκρατωρ, which has not neceſſarily that unlimited and ſublime ſenſe which we aſcribe to the term 'Almighty.' We may render παντοκρατωρ by 'Lord of all,' or 'the univerſal king,' and this title Cerinthus, would not have refuſed to our Saviour in his ſtate of glory. The other titles 'the beginning and the ending' ver. 8. and 'the firſt and the laſt' ver. 11. are wanting in moſt manuſcripts of the Apocalypſe. And in ch. i. 17. ii. 8. where ὁ πρωτος και ὁ εσχατος again occurs, the Alexandrine MS. has ὁ πρωτοτοκος και ὁ εσχατος, 'the firſt-born, and the laſt.'

Beſide the Alogi there were other adverſaries of the Apocalypſe, who lived partly at the ſame time with them, and partly in the beginning of the third century, of whom however we know only of one perſon by name, and this is the Roman Preſbyter Caius, provided the Apocalypſe, of which he ſpeaks, is the ſame as that,

which is contained in our canon. Theſe adverſaries of the Apocalypſe muſt be carefully diſtinguiſhed from the Alogi, for though they agreed in the ſame manifeſt error, that of aſcribing the Apocalypſe to Cerinthus, yet they materially differed in this reſpect, that the former received the Goſpel of St. John, having no antipathy, like the Alogi to the term Λογος, the name of Chriſt's divine nature, and rejected the Apocalypſe for other reaſons, the principal of which was their diſapprobation of the doctrine of the Millennium. The principles likewiſe, which Dionyſius of Alexandria aſcribes to the former, are very different from thoſe, which Epiphanius aſſigns to the latter.

Of the adverſaries of the Apocalypſe, which are now the ſubject of our inquiry, to whom however I can give no diſtinguiſhing appellation, as they have never been placed in the catalogue of heretics, the only accounts now on record are contained in two paſſages of the Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of Euſebius, B. iii. ch. 28. and B. vii. ch. 25. In the former place, which relates principally to Cerinthus, Euſebius quotes a ſhort paſſage from the works of the Roman Preſbyter Caius, who lived about the year 210, in which Caius ſpeaks of an Apocalypſe; but whether he means the Apocalypſe contained in our canon, or ſome other book with this title, but now loſt, is a queſtion, on which the learned have been divided. Euſebius then gives a ſhort extract from the writings of Dionyſius, in which certain perſons are mentioned, who lived in Egypt, and aſcribed the Apocalypſe, by which is certainly meant the ſame, as that which is contained in our canon, to Cerinthus. In the latter place, Euſebius gives a more copious extract from the writings of Dionyſius, in which Dionyſius mentions ſeveral particulars relative to the Apocalypſe, and likewiſe delivers his own ſentiments upon it. This Dionyſius was appointed biſhop of Alexandria in Egypt, in the year 247, and died either in 264 or 265. When therefore he ſays, 'ſome, who lived before our time, (τινες των προ ημων), aſcribed to Cerinthus, the Apocalypſe, which bears the

name of St. John,' it is not improbable that theſe adverſaries of the Apocalypſe were contemporaries of Caius. But they appear to have lived in Egypt: and as Dionyſius has not mentioned Caius by name, it is not certain that Dionyſius meant to include him under the general title 'ſome, who lived before our time.' Conſequently, though the Apocalypſe, of which Dionyſius ſpeaks, is undoubtedly the Apocalypſe contained in our canon, yet his ſaying, that ſome who lived before his time aſcribed the Apocalypſe to Cerinthus, is no certain proof that Caius did ſo: for though Caius aſcribed to Cerinthus the Apocalypſe, of which he himſelf ſpake, it is at leaſt poſſible that he meant ſome other work, now loſt, which bore the ſame name. Whether he did, or did not, I will now proceed to examine.

The paſſage, in which the ſentiments of Caius are delivered, Euſebius has quoted from a work of Caius, entitled Ζητησις, in the following words, but has unfortunately left us in the dark with reſpect to their connexion with what preceded and followed. Αλλα και Κηρινθος ὁ δι' αποκαλυψεων, ὡς ὑπο Αποστολε μεγαλε γεγραμμενων, τερατολογιας ἡμιν ὡς δι' ἀγγελων αυτῳ δεδειγμενας ψευδομενος επεισαγει, λεγων μετα την αναστασιν επιγειον ειναι το βασιλειον τε Χριστε· και παλιν, επιθυμιαις και ἡδοναις εν Ἱερουσαλημ την σαρκα πολιτευομενην δουλευειν. Και εχθρος ὑπαρχων ταις γραφαις τε Θεε, αριθμον χιλιονταετιας εν γαμῳ ἑορτης, θελων πλανᾳν, λεγει γινεσθαι. Here Caius condemns in very warm terms an Apocalypſe, which he deſcribes as a forgery of Cerinthus. But the queſtion is; does the ſhort deſcription, which Caius gives of this work, warrant the concluſion, that he meant the Apocalypſe, which we aſcribe to St. John, and conſequently that he attributed our canonical Apocalypſe to Cerinthus: or muſt we conclude, that he ſpake of ſome other work, bearing the ſame title, which he repreſented as a work forged by Cerinthus in the name of St. John?

In the Apocalypſe, of which Caius ſpeaks, was taught the doctrine that Chriſt would reign a thouſand years

on

on earth, and that Jerusalem would be the chief seat of his kingdom. Now that Christ will reign a thousand years with the faithful, is said in our Apocalypse, ch. xx. 4.: and, though no mention is made of Jerusalem by name in this chapter, yet 'the beloved city' ver. 9. which Gog and Magog should encompass, might from a comparison of Ezek. xxxviii, xxxix. where Gog is represented as encompassing the land of Israel, be easily explained of Jerusalem. Justin Martyr really understood it in this sense: and in ch. xxi. a city called expressly Jerusalem, is described as the seat of God and of the Lamb after the second resurrection. Of festivities and the indulgence of carnal appetites, which, according to the Apocalypse, of which Caius speaks, were to take place in this kingdom of a thousand years, no express mention is made in our Apocalypse: but interpreters in their explanation of a book frequently discover what is not literally contained in it. Besides, there is no necessity for taking the expression 'indulgence of carnal appetites' in its very worst sense, for it denotes, not solely the unlawful gratifications of promiscuous concubinage, but likewise the legitimate pleasures of the marriage state: and commentators do not usually represent the kingdom of a thousand years, which is to take place after the first resurrection, as a kingdom, in which the marriage state will be forbidden. Further, the expression γαμος τȣ ἀρνιȣ, ch. xix. 7. 9. though we consider it, as denoting the marriage of the lamb with the church, might suggest to a reader of the Apocalypse, the notion of festivities and enjoyments, which were to attend the celebration of the marriage.

It appears then, that Caius in the passage, of which he speaks of an Apocalypse, has some things, which are not literally contained in our canonical Apocalypse: and we must therefore conclude, either that he substituted interpretation for text, or that he spake of a different Apocalypse from that, which is contained in our canon. Mr. Hartwig, in his excellent 'Apology for

for the Apocalypſe[k], ſupports the latter part of the alternative, and with great perſpicuity of reaſoning endeavours to ſhew, that Caius could not have ſpoken of our Apocalypſe in the manner in which he has done. I confeſs however, that I am ſtill in doubt. For, in the firſt place, it is evident, that whatever was the Apocalypſe of which Caius ſpake, he was ſtrongly prejudiced againſt it, and aſcribed it to Cerinthus. Conſequently, it is not at all extraordinary, that he ſhould be unjuſt in the explanation of it, and aſcribe to it doctrines, which it did not literally contain. And it will preſently appear, that ſome others of the ancients, of whom no doubt can be made, that they meant our Apocalypſe, were as unjuſt in their explanations of it, as Caius can be ſuppoſed to have been, and repreſented doctrines as really contained in it, which were in fact the invention of the Millennarians. Secondly, if Caius really meant an Apocalypſe different from that, which is contained in our canon, it muſt afford juſt matter of ſurpriſe, that he ſhould be the only writer of all antiquity, to whom this other Apocalypſe appears to have been known; for not only no fragments of another Apocalypſe are now extant, but no other writer has made the leaſt mention of it. I own then, that I am diſpoſed to accede to the opinion of thoſe, who maintain, that the Apocalypſe, which Caius attributed to Cerinthus, was no other than that, which we aſcribe to St. John: and this opinion is ſtrongly corroborated by the circumſtance, that other perſons, who were contemporaries of Caius, aſcribed to Cerinthus that very Apocalypſe, which is contained in our canon. An abſolute deciſion is not to be obtained, ſince the writings of Caius are no longer extant, and other ancient authors, who had acceſs to his writings, are not ſufficiently explicit on this ſubject. Mr. Hartwig has indeed endeavoured

[k] Vol. I. p. 33—228. In my review of this work in the Orient. Biblioth. Vol. XXI. N° 312, I have delivered my ſentiments at large, eſpecially on what the author ſays relative to Caius.

endeavoured to ſhew, that the ancients did not underſtand Caius, as if he meant our canonical Apocalypſe: but, though I grant, that Mr. Hartwig's Apology is in general a very admirable work, his arguments on this point have left me without conviction [l].

Having examined the ſentiments of Caius, I have in the next place to conſider the opinion of the 'certain perſons in Egypt,' who undoubtedly aſcribed our Apocalypſe to Cerinthus. The account of them is contained in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Euſebius, B. vii. ch. 25. where he has given a very important extract, from the 'books on the promiſes,' written by Dionyſius, biſhop of Alexandria.

At Arſinoe in Egypt the doctrine of the Millennium had gained ſuch ground among the Chriſtians, that it baniſhed from their thoughts the moſt important precepts of their religion. The principal work, which had been written in that country in defence of the Millennium, was entitled Ελεγχος αλληγοριστων (Confutation of the Allegoriſts), and had Nepos, an Egyptian biſhop, for its author, who endeavoured to prove this doctrine from the Revelation of St. John. Nepos was already deceaſed, when Dionyſius, in the year 247, was appointed biſhop of Alexandria: he lived therefore about the beginning of the century, and conſequently at this period the Revelation of St. John was already received in Egypt. Dionyſius openly oppoſed the doctrine of the Millennium, not indeed with that vehemence, which we have ſometimes occaſion to cenſure in the ancient fathers, but with a moderation and gentleneſs, which would do honour to the preſent age. In a dialogue, written in a very friendly tone [m], he confuted the above mentioned work of Nepos in ſo ſucceſsful a manner,

[l] See what I have ſaid in the review mentioned in the preceding note.

[m] An account of this dialogue is given by Euſebius at the end of the 24th chapter of the ſeventh book of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

a manner, that he convinced every one, who had adopted the principles of Nepos, that they were erroneous. He then wrote his two 'books on the promiſes,' from which I will quote the following paſſage, preſerved in the above-mentioned chapter of Euſebius, becauſe it affords a proof of the mild character of Dionyſius. 'Since they appeal to a work of Nepos, and ground their opinions upon it, as if it indiſputably proved a future kingdom of Chriſt on earth, I will grant indeed, that in many reſpects I follow Nepos, and that I eſteem him on account of his faith, his labours, his diligence in expounding the Bible, and alſo on account of his hymns, which many of our brethren ſtill uſe to their edification; and I have ſo much the more reſpect for him, as he is gone to his reſt before us; but the truth is dearer and more valuable to me than every thing elſe.' He then proceeds to mention the great repute, in which this work of Nepos then ſtood, and after having obſerved, what injury millennarian principles had done, he concludes with the following words. 'I felt myſelf therefore under the neceſſity of diſputing with my brother Nepos in the ſame manner, as if he were ſtill alive.' The opinion, which Dionyſius himſelf entertained of the Apocalypſe, will be delivered in its proper place, when the order of time brings us to him. At preſent I ſhall add only the paſſage preſerved by Euſebius[n], in which Dionyſius relates how ſome perſons, who lived before his time, and therefore probably about the beginning of the third century, condemned the Apocalypſe. 'Some, who lived before our time[o], have totally rejected this book. They find ſomething

[n] B. vii. Ch. 25.

[o] *Τινες των προ ημων.* The obvious interpretation of theſe words is, 'ſome teachers of Chriſtianity in Egypt, who lived at the beginning of the third, or at the end of the ſecond century.' Whether Dionyſius had the Roman preſbyter Caius likewiſe in view, is a queſtion not eaſily to be determined. As to the word *τινες*, Mr. Hartwig conſiders it, as denoting perſons very inconſiderable both in number,

ſomething to cenſure in every chapter: they endeavour to ſhew, that the whole is obſcure and unconnected: and they accuſe even the title of it of containing falſehoods, ſince it is neither a work of St. John, nor can be called a Revelation, becauſe every thing in it is concealed under a thick covering of darkneſs. They conſider, not only no Apoſtle, but no pious member of the church whatſoever, as the author of this book: but aſcribe it to Cerinthus, who falſely prefixed a reſpectable name to a work, which he himſelf had forged. What this man, ſenſual and drunken in carnal indulgencies, himſelf deſired, this (they ſay) he propheſied, namely the ſatiating of the belly, and the gratification of fleſhly luſts, by eating, drinking, marrying, and, in order to render the matter leſs offenſive, by feaſts and feaſt-offerings.' From the preceding deſcription it appears, that ſome of the reaſons aſſigned by theſe perſons for rejecting the book of Revelation were weak; for inſtance, the argument, that it cannot be called a Revelation, becauſe it is obſcure, which is a mere diſpute about words: and moreover, that they found in it what it does not literally contain. But the fact itſelf, namely, that certain adverſaries of the Millennium, at the end of the ſecond and the beginning of the third century, denied, that St. John was the author of the Apocalypſe, is a matter not to be diſputed. They puſhed however their objection beyond the bounds of probability in aſcribing it to Cerinthus. Before I conclude this paragraph, I muſt recommend to the reader to conſult what Lardner[p] has ſaid on this paſſage of Dionyſius, as he has made ſome very excellent remarks.

I now

number and in conſequence. But for my own part, I ſee nothing contemptible in this expreſſion: at leaſt I myſelf have frequently uſed the term 'ſome ſay,' when the perſons, whom I had in view, were men of great reputation, or not inconſiderable as to their number.

[p] Credibility, P. II. Vol. ii. p. 630—684.

I now come to an advocate for the Apocalypſe, whoſe authority contributed perhaps more, than is commonly ſuppoſed, to its reception in the church, namely the biſhop and martyr Hippolytus, who lived, as is generally believed, in the beginning of the third century, and is ſuppoſed, though this is not quite certain, to have been biſhop of Aden in Arabia Felix. The whole tendency of his writings appears to have been apocalyptical: at leaſt the title of the books, 'on the Song of Solomon, on Zacharias, on Daniel, on ſome paſſages in Ezekiel, on Antichriſt,' diſcover contents, which are cloſely allied to the Apocalypſe. In his book on Antichriſt he ſays expreſsly, 'St. John ſaw in the iſland of Patmos dreadful myſteries, which he taught to others without envy:' and immediately after he addreſſes St. John in the following words, 'Tell me, holy John, thou Apoſtle and Diſciple of Chriſt, what thou haſt ſeen of Babylon.' Among the writings of Hippolytus, Jerom mentions one, which was entitled, 'on the Apocalypſe:' and on the ſtatue of Hippolytus, diſcovered at Rome in 1551, on which are engraved the titles of his writings, one of them is, 'on St. John's Goſpel and the Apocalypſe[q].' Lardner ſuppoſes, that it was a defence of theſe two books, becauſe Ebedjeſu expreſsly mentions, that Hippolytus wrote ſuch a work. Lardner however at the ſame time obſerves, that Andrew of Cæſarea has ſeveral times quoted a commentary on the Apocalypſe, aſcribed to Hippolytus[r]. This Ebedjeſu, in the ſeventh chapter of his metrical catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writings, mentions among other works of Hippolytus,

Chapters againſt Caius:
And a defence of the Apocalypſe,
And the Goſpel of St. John,
The Apoſtle and Evangeliſt.

This

[q] Περι τε κατα Ιωαννην ευαγγελιε και αποκαλυψεως.

[r] Lardner's Credibility, P. II. Vol. ii. ch. 35.

This defence muſt have been oppoſed to the Alogi, becauſe it relates to the Goſpel as well as to the Apocalypſe, and the Alogi were the only perſons, who rejected both. The Caius, againſt whom he wrote certain chapters, is commonly ſuppoſed to be the heretic Caius, mentioned by Irenæus. But as the Apocalypſe was the favourite ſubject of Hippolytus, it is not improbable, that theſe chapters were written againſt the Roman preſbyter Caius, and contained likewiſe a defence of the Apocalypſe, perhaps alſo of the Millennium, and of the doctrine concerning Antichriſt. If this repreſentation be juſt, Hippolytus wrote two defences of the Apocalypſe, the one againſt Caius, the other againſt the Alogi, who rejected, beſide the Apocalypſe, the Goſpel of St. John.

Further, Jacob, the Syrian, who was biſhop of Edeſſa from the year 651 to the year 710, has quoted in terms of the higheſt commendation, a commentary on the Apocalypſe by Hippolytus. This quotation is in the Syriac works of Ephrem, Vol. I. p. 192. of the edition printed at Rome, where there is a commentary on Geneſis, formed partly from the writings of Ephrem, and partly from thoſe of Jacob. In the place in queſtion Jacob explains Gen. xlix. 17. of Antichriſt, and ſays; 'The Spirit, which is in the ſaints, interprets this power as denoting the Roman empire. This was made known by the Spirit, who ſpake by the mouth of the holy biſhop and martyr Hippolytus, when he explained the Revelation of St. John the Divine'. Whether this expoſition or commentary on the Apocalypſe was a ſeparate work, or only interwoven with his defence of the Apocalypſe, or his book on Antichriſt, it is difficult at preſent to determine: but this evidently appears, that Hippolytus was highly eſteemed by ſome of the Syrian writers. His works, of which ſome perhaps were written in Syriac, and tranſlated into Greek,

ﻭﻫﻮ ﻣﻦ ﻗﺒﻞ ﺍﻟﺮﻭﺡ ﺍﻟﻘﺪﺱ ﺍﻟﺬﻱ ﻓﻲ ﺍﻟﻘﺪﻳﺴﻴﻦ ﻓﺴﺮ ﻫﺬﻩ ﺍﻟﻘﻮﺓ ﻛﻤﺎ ﻗﺎﻝ ﺍﻟﺮﻭﻣﺎﻥ ﻭﻫﺬﺍ ﺍﻟﺴﺮ ﺍﻋﻠﻦ ﻣﻦ ﻗﺒﻞ ﺍﻟﺮﻭﺡ ﺍﻟﻘﺪﺱ ﺍﻟﻨﺎﻃﻖ ﻓﻲ ﻓﻢ ﺍﻟﻘﺪﻳﺲ ﺍﻻﺳﻘﻒ ﻭﺍﻟﺸﻬﻴﺪ ﻫﺮﻗﻠﻴﻄﻮﺱ ﺍﻟﺬﻱ ﻓﺴﺮ ﺭﺅﻳﺎ ﻳﻮﺣﻨﺎ ﺍﻟﻼﻫﻮﺗﻲ ﻭﺍﻟﻠﻪ ﺍﻋﻠﻢ &c.

Greek, muſt have remained many ages in the Eaſt, before they were loſt: for they were ſtill quoted in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by Barſalibæus and Barhebræus [t].

The next writer after Hippolytus is Origen, who, notwithſtanding his warm oppoſition to the doctrine of the Millennium, received likewiſe the Apocalypſe as a work of St. John the Apoſtle. The words of Origen, as quoted by Euſebius [u], are as follow. 'What ſhall we ſay of John, who leaned on the breaſt of Jeſus? He has left us a Goſpel, and has aſſured us, that he could write more, than the whole world could contain. He wrote likewiſe a Revelation, in which he was ordered to ſeal up thoſe things, which the ſeven thunders uttered: alſo an Epiſtle, of a moderate length, and perhaps a ſecond and a third.' Here every one muſt be deſirous to know what reaſons induced Origen, who took ſo decided a part againſt the doctrine of the Millennium, to receive the Apocalypſe, without expreſſing any doubt of its authenticity: but theſe reaſons he has no where aſſigned. Did the example and authority of Hippolytus, who ſerved in ſome reſpects as a pattern to Origen, influence his opinion? or was he actuated by other motives? or did he conduct himſelf in the ſame manner, as we have reaſon to believe his diſciple Dionyſius did, whoſe opinion will be examined in the following paragraph?

Dionyſius, the modeſt adverſary of the Millennarians, was a diſciple of Origen, and ſurvived his maſter only eleven or twelve years [x]. I have already related what Dionyſius has ſaid concerning the opinion of certain adverſaries of the Apocalypſe: at preſent we have to examine, what his own opinion was. This was a medium between the opinion of thoſe, who aſcribe the Apoca-

[t] Aſſemani Bibl. Orient. Tom. II. p. 158, 283—314.

[u] Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. VI. cap. 25. More paſſages to this purpoſe are collected by Lardner, P. II. Vol. ii.

[x] Origen died in 253, Dionyſius in 264 or 265.

Apocalypſe to St. John the Apoſtle, and the opinion of thoſe, who conſider it as a forgery of Cerinthus. He aſſigns very important reaſons, which diſcover a ſound critical judgment, for not believing that St. John the Apoſtle was the author of it: but he does not reject it as a forgery, for he adds, that it was written perhaps by ſome other John, who was likewiſe an holy inſpired man. Now this deciſive mode of expreſſing himſelf on the one ſide, and his dubious mode of expreſſing himſelf on the other, renders it a matter of doubt, whether Dionyſius believed in his heart, that the Apocalypſe was really a divine work. In his 'two books on the promiſes,' his great object was to confute the doctrine of the Millennium: if then the Apocalypſe was at that time received in Egypt as a divine work, he would have defeated his own purpoſe if he had openly rejected it. The only plan, which he could adopt with ſafety, was to argue from premiſes admitted by his adverſaries, and granting the authority of the Apocalypſe, to ſhew, that not even this book, when properly explained, contained a proof of their doctrine, ſince the paſſages to which they appealed, were capable of a different interpretation from that of a thouſand years kingdom of Chriſt on earth, all which, according to Euſebius, he did very fully and completely. This plan was perfectly conſiſtent with the gentle character of Dionyſius, and deſerves not ſo much the name of a pious fraud, as that of an hypothetical confutation. At leaſt I am certain, that if in a controverſy between a catholic and a proteſtant, relative to a point of doctrine, the catholic appealed to a book of the Apocrypha, which the church of Rome receives as canonical, but the reformed church does not, and the proteſtant, inſtead of refuſing to admit the appeal, ſhould concede it to his adverſary, without entering into its merits, but ſhew at the ſame time, that not even the paſſages appealed to contained a proof of the doctrine in queſtion, no one would accuſe the proteſtant of diſſimulation or diſhoneſty. In fact, Dionyſius takes great pains to prove that the Apocalypſe was not

written by St. John the Apoſtle, and his arguments are of great weight: but this point being once proved, the canonical authority of the Apocalypſe muſt totter of itſelf. For though it ſhould be granted, that the author of it was not an impoſtor, but that he was a reſpectable man, and had no intention to deceive, yet what ſecurity can we have that he was not deceived himſelf, and that he was not hurried away by the force of his own imagination. I accede therefore, to the opinion of Lardner, who ſays, that Dionyſius undoubtedly knew what he was doing, and that it was not without reaſon, that he took ſo much pains to ſhew, that the Apocalypſe was not written by an Apoſtle. On the other hand, the reaſons, which Dionyſius aſſigns for his not venturing to reject the Apocalypſe, are wholly devoid of importance. One of them is, 'becauſe many of his brethren highly eſteemed it:' but this is a motive of mere delicacy, and may be a reaſon why an author ſhould not openly reject a book, leſt his brethren ſhould be offended, but it affords no ground of private conviction. His other reaſon is ſtill more extraordinary, namely, that he was unable to explain the Apocalypſe, and therefore could not reject it, but muſt admire it the more, the leſs he underſtood it. Now I grant, that a book containing prophecies is not immediately to be rejected, merely becauſe we do not underſtand it: for the fault may lie with us, and a prophecy may be unintelligible till it is fulfilled. But when the queſtion is in agitation, whether a book, which lays claim to prophecy, ought to be received or not, the circumſtance that we do not underſtand it cannot poſſibly afford a poſitive argument for its reception. For at that rate every obſcure fanatical compoſition of the preſent age, ſuch as Oettinger's terreſtrial and celeſtial philoſophy, would be entitled to the appellation of a divine work. Dionyſius's own words, in which he aſſigns the two preceding reaſons, are as follow. 'I will not however venture to reject the Apocalypſe, becauſe many of the brethren highly eſteem it. On the contrary, I appre-

hend,

hend, that this book ſurpaſſes my comprehenſion, and that it is full of myſterious things. And as I do not underſtand it, I ſuppoſe, that the words have a certain hidden meaning, which I do not pretend to meaſure, or to judge according to my capacity; but I behold them in faith as things above my comprehenſion. I do not reject what I do not comprehend, but admire it the more the leſs I underſtand it.' Now I have not the leaſt doubt, that, if any modern writer, ſhould aſſign theſe reaſons, and theſe reaſons only, for not rejecting the Apocalypſe, every man would immediately conclude that in reality he did not believe it. Much more then are we warranted to draw this inference of one of the ancient fathers, who were accuſtomed to argue, as it is called, ſecundum œconomiam: and d'A—t obſerves, in his above-mentioned Diſcours ſur l'Apocalypſe, that even Athanaſius has taken notice of this œconomical mode of argumentation in Dionyſius. All that we can ſay then of the ſentiments of Dionyſius, is, that they were a medium between the opinion of thoſe, who aſcribed the Apocalypſe to St. John the Apoſtle, and the opinion of thoſe, who declared it to be a forgery of Cerinthus. That it was not written by St. John he poſitively aſſerts; and that he did not in his heart believe it to be a divine work, is at leaſt highly probable, though I grant that in one inſtance, namely, in an Epiſtle to Hermammon, he quotes a paſſage of it as fulfilled in the reign of Valerian[z].

But whatever was the opinion of Dionyſius in reſpect to the Apocalypſe, we muſt recollect that his reaſons for not aſcribing it to St. John are not hiſtorical, but critical[a]; conſequently their importance depends, not on the antiquity of the writer who aſſigned them, but merely on their own internal ſtrength. Further, ſince Dionyſius

[z] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. VII. c. 10.

[a] On this account I reſerve them for the ſection in which I ſhall examine the language of the Apocalypſe.

nyſius has quoted no hiſtorical evidence, or teſtimony of any more ancient writer againſt the Apocalypſe, this circumſtance is in ſome meaſure in its favour. For, if it were not written by St. John, we have reaſon to wonder that neither Dionyſius, nor his predeceſſors, neither the Alogi, nor Caius ſhould have alleged againſt a work, ſuppoſed to have been firſt uſhered into the world about the year 120, any arguments like the following: it is not preſerved in the archives of the ſeven Aſiatic churches: the oldeſt perſons in thoſe cities have no knowledge of its having been ſent thither: no one ever ſaw it during the life of John: it was introduced in ſuch and ſuch a year, but was contradicted as ſoon as it appeared. Arguments like theſe would have at once determined the queſtion in diſpute: but ſince we meet with no ſuch arguments in the writings of the ancient adverſaries of the Apocalypſe, its very adverſaries have given it, I will not ſay a deciſive advantage [b], but certainly an advantage, which merits conſideration.

After the age of Dionyſius, the number of eccleſiaſtical writers who quote the Apocalypſe as a divine work, eſpecially the members of the Latin church, begins to increaſe. But as they are of leſs importance than the more ancient writers, and I have little or nothing to remark on their quotations, I ſhall content myſelf with barely mentioning their names, and referring to Lardner, by whom their quotations are collected. According to Lardner then the Apocalypſe is quoted by Cyprian [c], by the anonymous author of a work againſt the Novatians [d], by the Novatians themſelves [e], by Commodian [f], by Victorinus [g], who was a very zealous advocate for the doctrine

[b] The advantage is for two reaſons not deciſive: firſt, becauſe only a few extracts from the writings of the ancient adverſaries of the Apocalypſe are now extant, the writings themſelves being loſt: and ſecondly, becauſe the ancient advocates of the Apocalypſe have likewiſe not alleged any hiſtorical arguments in its defence.

[c] See Lardner's Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory, Part II. Vol. II. p. 777, 778.

[d] Ib. p. 812.

[e] P. II. Vol. III. p. 100.

[f] Ib. p. 127.

[g] Ib. p. 202. 216, 217.

doctrine of the Millennium, and likewiſe wrote an Expoſition of the Apocalypſe, by Methodius [h], the Manicheans [i], Arnobius [k], the Donatiſts [l], and by Lactantius [m], who was a contemporary of Euſebius, but by no means equal to him in a critical inquiry like the preſent. On the Manicheans however I muſt make one remark, becauſe Beauſobre and Lardner are of different opinions in reſpect to their reception of the Apocalypſe. The reaſon aſſigned by Lardner for his opinion, that the Manicheans received the Apocalypſe as a canonical book, is that their adverſaries ſometimes confuted them by quotations from it. Beauſobre [n] on the contrary contends that the Manicheans could not have received the Apocalypſe, becauſe, when their ſect was founded, it had not been tranſlated into Syriac, and Manes, the founder of their ſect, whoſe native language was Syriac or Chaldee, did not underſtand Greek. But though I grant that the Syriac verſion of the Apocalypſe, which we have at preſent, was made long after the time of Manes, it is poſſible that a ſtill more ancient verſion of it exiſted, from which perhaps Ephrem quoted: and in this more ancient verſion, Manes, who was born in the year 240, might have read the Apocalypſe, though it made no part of the Syrian Vulgate. Further, as it is ſaid that Hippolytus, the moſt ancient advocate of the Apocalypſe, was biſhop of Aden in Arabia, and as Scythian, the predeceſſor of Manes, was a native Arabian, it muſt appear ſtill leſs improbable that the Manicheans were acquainted with the Apocalypſe. On the other hand, if they received it merely in conſequence of the defence of Hippolytus, their reception of it can hardly be alleged as an additional proof of its divinity.

We now return to Euſebius, with whoſe opinion I began this ſection: but I much doubt, whether all the evidence,

[h] Part II. Vol. III. p. 256, 257.
[i] Ib. p. 688.
[k] P. II. Vol. IV. p. 53.
[l] Ib. p. 233.
[m] Ib. p. 183.
[n] Hiſtories des Manichéens, L. I. Ch. v. §. 3.

evidence, which we have examined has brought us a ſtep nearer to the deciſion of the main queſtion, than we were when we ſet out, or whether we are better able to form a determinate opinion, than Euſebius. That Origen, notwithſtanding his diſlike to the doctrine of the Millennium, received the Apocalypſe as canonical, is a circumſtance greatly in its favour: but that Papias, the father of the Millennarians, knew nothing of it, is a circumſtance which operates at leaſt as ſtrongly againſt it. And upon the whole, when we place in one ſcale the few, but important writers, who either knew nothing of it or rejected it, and in the other ſcale the more numerous but leſs important writers, who received it, the balance will remain in the ſame equipoiſe, in which Euſebius himſelf appears to have regarded it.

SECT. III.

Inference deduced from the preceding ſection.

HAVING examined the evidence for and againſt the Apocalypſe, I muſt now propoſe the queſtion: How is it poſſible, that this book, if really written by St. John the Apoſtle, ſhould have either been wholly unknown, or conſidered as a work of doubtful authority, in the very earlieſt ages of Chriſtians? The other Apoſtolical Epiſtles are addreſſed only to ſingle communities or churches: but the Apocalypſe, according to its own contents, was expreſsly ordered by Chriſt himſelf, in a command to St. John the Apoſtle, to be ſent to ſeven churches: and not only theſe ſeven churches were in that part of Aſia Minor, where Chriſtianity was in the moſt flouriſhing ſituation, but one of them was Epheſus, where St. John ſpent the latter part of his life, and conſequently

ſequently where every work of St. John muſt have been perfectly well known. If St. John then had actually ſent the Apocalypſe to theſe ſeven churches, and that too, not as a private Epiſtle, but as a Revelation made to him by Jeſus Chriſt, one ſhould ſuppoſe that its authenticity could not have been doubted, eſpecially at a time, when there were the beſt means of obtaining information. We cannot ſay that the book was kept ſecret, or was concealed in the archives, leſt the prophecies againſt Rome ſhould draw a perſecution on the Chriſtians; for ſecrecy is contrary to the tenor of the book, and the author of it enjoins that it ſhould be both read and heard[o]. Under theſe circumſtances the authenticity of the Apocalypſe appears to me very doubtful, and I cannot avoid entertaining a ſuſpicion, that it is a ſpurious production, introduced probably into the world after the death of St. John.

SECT. IV.

Of the opinions of eccleſiaſtical writers who lived ſince the time of Euſebius.

EUSEBIUS, who was in poſſeſſion of almoſt all the information, which has been communicated in the preceding ſections, remained, as we have ſeen, in doubt. Some centuries later, theſe doubts conſiderably abated, eſpecially among the members of the Latin church, who at laſt received the Apocalypſe almoſt unanimouſly. Here we may juſtly aſk: What new diſcoveries were made by the church of Rome preciſely in the ages of ignorance and barbariſm, which enabled it to ſee clearly what remained obſcure to Euſebius? We cannot ſuppoſe that

[o] Ch. i. 3.

that the members of this church had acceſs to ancient documents, which were unknown to Euſebius: nor is it credible that they had ſo much more critical ſagacity, as to enable them from the documents and evidence, which they had in common with Euſebius, to draw a deciſive inference, where he remained in doubt, and to detect a truth, to which he was unable to penetrate. I admit that caſes may occur, in which later and even leſs enlightened ages may be better able to determine, whether a book which lays claim to prophecy, be really a divine work, or not, than former and more enlightened ages, becauſe the fulfilling of prophecies affords the beſt proof of their being divine, and this can be known only to poſterity. But then the prophecies muſt be ſo clear and determinate, as to leave no room for doubt that they really relate to the events to which they are referred. Now this is ſo far from being the caſe in regard to the Apocalypſe, that to this very day the commentators are not agreed as to its meaning: and the events, which proteſtants ſuppoſe are predicted in it, could never enter into the imagination of the members of the Latin church, when they admitted it into the canon.

As it would be uſeleſs to enumerate all the later writers, who have either received or rejected the Apocalypſe, ſince the time of its compoſition is ſo far removed from the ages in which they lived, that they cannot be conſidered as evidence, I ſhall merely refer to the writings of Lardner. That moſt of the later Latin fathers received the Apocalypſe has been already obſerved: I will proceed therefore at preſent to examine what was ſaid by the Greek writers after the time of Euſebius, from whom we may reaſonably expect more ſatisfactory information relative to a book addreſſed to ſeven churches in Aſia Minor.

Epiphanius, who on account of the diligence which he beſtowed on eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, deſerves to be mentioned the firſt after Euſebius, though he had neither the ſame calm judgment, nor the ſame critical penetration, received the Apocalypſe, and defended it, in his

fifty-firſt Hereſy, againſt the Alogi, who rejected both the Apocalypſe and St. John's Goſpel. But Epiphanius himſelf does not appear to have been ſo thoroughly perſuaded of the divinity of the former, as he was of the divinity of the latter: for he ſays, that, if the Alogi received the Goſpel of St. John, he would aſcribe their rejection of the Apocalypſe to their caution not to admit an apocryphal book [p]. Now, when we conſider that this declaration was made by a writer, who was at other times accuſtomed to ſpeak in rather ungentle terms againſt heretics, his defence of the Apocalypſe as a divine book muſt appear ſomewhat inconſiſtent with ſo dubious an opinion reſpecting thoſe who rejected it.

In the catalogue of ſacred writings annexed to the canons of the council of Laodicea, which was held in the year 363, the Apocalypſe is totally omitted. Now, if this catalogue be genuine, it is very unfavourable to the Apocalypſe, becauſe one of the apocalyptical Epiſtles is addreſſed to the biſhop of Laodicea, and therefore a council of biſhops aſſembled in that city may be ſuppoſed to be competent judges of the queſtion, whether the Apocalypſe was ſent by St. John to the biſhop of Laodicea, or not. But Profeſſor Spittler has, as I think, very clearly ſhewn, that the whole of the ſixteenth canon, which contains this catalogue is a forgery [q]: and therefore this catalogue cannot be alleged in future as evidence againſt the Apocalypſe.

Cyril of Jeruſalem, who was biſhop of that city from the year 350 to 386, not only omitted the Apocalypſe in his catalogue of canonical writings, but concluded this catalogue by warning every one not to read even in his own houſe the books which he had omitted, as being books not read in the church [r]. And he himſelf, in the very place where he treats of the doctrine relative to Antichriſt,

[p] The words of Epiphanius have been already quoted in this volume, Ch. xxxi. Sect. 4.

[q] See his 'Critical Inquiry into the ſixteenth canon of the council of Laodicea,' publiſhed at Bremen in 1777.

[r] Lardner, P. II. Vol. VIII. p. 270.

Antichriſt, appeals to the book of Daniel, to Matth. xxiv., and 2 Theſſ. ii., without even naming the Apocalypſe [s].

Gregory of Nazianzen is of great importance in the preſent inquiry, not ſo much on his own account, as on account of an inference which may be drawn from him in reſpect to Papias. Gregory in his metrical catalogue of canonical writings mentions the ſeven Catholic Epiſtles, including therefore even thoſe of which the authenticity had been called in queſtion. Yet he wholly omits the Apocalypſe: and concludes his catalogue by ſaying, that the books, which he has not mentioned are ſpurious. But notwithſtanding this, Andrew of Cæſarea in the preface to his Expoſition of the Apocalypſe has mentioned Gregory among the advocates for the Apocalypſe. If Andrew then has made ſo groſs a miſtake in reſpect to Gregory, his aſſertion that Papias likewiſe was an advocate for the Apocalypſe is entitled to no credit: and we may infer from the arguments advanced in the ſecond ſection of this chapter, that Papias neither quoted nor even knew of the Apocalypſe. How ſtrongly this operates againſt the Apocalypſe has been already noticed in its proper place. On the other hand, though Gregory has rejected the Apocalypſe from his catalogue of canonical books, yet according to Lardner [t] he has quoted it in two inſtances. Since therefore it may be doubted, whether Andrew was ſo groſsly miſtaken in reſpect to Gregory, and conſequently whether he made a ſimilar miſtake in reſpect to Papias, I will rather leave the queſtion undecided, that every man may draw the inference which he thinks the beſt.

Gregory of Nyſſa places the Apocalypſe among the apocryphal writings [u].

Amphilochius, who was biſhop of Iconium about the year 370, ſays in his metrical catalogue of canonical books, 'Some aſcribe the Apocalypſe to St. John, but moſt perſons conſider it as ſpurious [x].' In fact, it was almoſt

[s] Lardner, P. II. Vol. VIII. p. 274.

[t] Vol. IX. p. 133—136. [u] Ib. p. 157. [x] Ib. p. 148.

almoſt univerſally conſidered as ſuch by the members of the Greek church at the end of the fourth century. Hence Jerom, in an Epiſtle to Dardanus, ſays that the Greek church rejected the Apocalypſe with the ſame freedom as the Latin church rejected the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, though he himſelf regarded the rejection of both of them as an innovation, which he diſapproved[y]: and Junilius, an African biſhop of the ſixth century, ſays, 'cæterum de Johannis Apocalypſi apud Orientales admodum dubitatur[z].' The authority of the Apocalypſe therefore, inſtead of gaining, loſt ground among the Greeks: and Lardner acknowledges, not only that the two celebrated Greek commentators, Chryſoſtom in the fourth, and Theophylact in the eleventh century, have not quoted it in a ſingle inſtance, but that Nicephorus, Patriarch of Conſtantinople, about the year 806 expreſsly rejected it *. All the Greek writers however, after the time of Euſebius did not reject it: for Cyril of Alexandria ſpeaks of it in doubtful terms, and Athanaſius, Dionyſius falſely called the Areopagite, Andrew of Cæſarea, Aretas, Œcumenius, and Nicephorus Calliſti, received it.

Before I cloſe the catalogue of Greek authorities for the Apocalypſe, I muſt ſay a few words relative to the Greek manuſcripts. Some of them contain the Apocalypſe alone. Now from ſuch manuſcripts we are not authoriſed to conclude, that at the time when they were written, this book was received as canonical in the Greek church of which the copyiſt was a member: nor does even the title, or ſubſcription, in which the Apocalypſe is aſcribed to St. John the Evangeliſt prove any thing, ſince in the copies of ſpurious, as well as of genuine works

[y] Quod ſi eam (ſcil. epiſt. ad Hebræos) Latinorum conſuetudo non recipit inter ſcripturas canonicas, nec Græcorum eccleſiæ Apocalypſin eadem libertate ſuſcipiunt, et tamen nos utramque ſuſcipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis conſuetudinem, ſed veterum auctoritatem ſequentes. Hieronymi Opp. Tom. II. p. 608.

[z] Lardner, Vol. XI. p. 298.

* Vol. X. p. 340. Vol. XI. 249. 252. 428.

works it is uſual to retain the titles unaltered. There are other manuſcripts, which contain no other book than the Apocalypſe, but have it accompanied with a commentary: ſuch for inſtance is the Codex Reuchlini[a], which contains the text of the Apocalypſe, together with the commentaries of Andrew of Cæſarea, and Aretas. Such manuſcripts prove no more than the preceding, that the Apocalypſe was received as canonical in the Greek church, at the time when they were written. To a third claſs may be referred ſuch as the Codex Alexandrinus, which contains the whole Bible, and with it the Apocalypſe. But then the Codex Alexandrinus contains likewiſe other books, which are certainly not canonical, for inſtance, the firſt Epiſtle of Clement to the Corinthians, and alſo ſeveral hymns. Conſequently we cannot infer, that the writer of this manuſcript conſidered the Apocalypſe as canonical: for if we draw this concluſion of the Apocalypſe, we muſt draw the ſame in reſpect to the firſt Epiſtle of Clement, and the other uncanonical books which this manuſcript contains. The fourth and laſt claſs conſiſts of ſuch manuſcripts as contain the Apocalypſe in company with books undoubtedly canonical, of which the Codex Seidelianus[b] is an inſtance. That the writers of ſuch manuſcripts conſidered the Apocalypſe as canonical, is very probable: but then theſe manuſcripts are for the moſt part modern. An enumeration of the ſeveral manuſcripts, which belong to each of theſe four claſſes, would take up at preſent too much room: and indeed it would be attended with ſome difficulty as our accounts of ſeveral manuſcripts of the Apocalypſe are very defective.

The fate of the Apocalypſe in the Latin church was very different from that, which it met with in the Greek. Both churches deviated from the medium adopted

[a] See N°. 221, in the catalogue of Greek MSS. given in the ſecond volume of this Introduction.

[b] See N°. 228, of the above-mentioned catalogue.

adopted by Euſebius. The Greek church became leſs favourable to it than he was, though we cannot tell by what arguments unknown to Euſebius the members of this church were ſwayed: and the Latin church, which was certainly leſs able to make new diſcoveries relative to a book addreſſed to ſeven communities in Aſia Minor, and after the death of Jerom was not very well qualified for critical inquiries, received the Apocalypſe as a work undoubtedly canonical. We muſt conclude therefore that its reception in the church of Rome was rather the effect of accident, than the reſult of an impartial and deliberate examination. At that time, the Popes and Councils little imagined that the Apocalypſe would one day become a repertory, in which the rebels againſt their authority would find weapons to attack the church from which they had apoſtatized, or they would hardly have canonized a work, from which the Pope was to be proved the Antichriſt, and Rome the apocalyptical whore.

Though it would be tedious to enumerate all the Latin fathers who received the Apocalypſe, I cannot paſs over in ſilence the celebrated names of Jerom and Auguſtin. Jerom received it[c], without doubt after a more cautious examination than was inſtituted by moſt of his ſucceſſors: and he appealed in ſupport of its authenticity to ancient teſtimonies, which certainly exiſted, and which have been already mentioned in the ſecond ſection of this chapter. Auguſtin[d] probably examined the queſtion much leſs critically than Jerom: yet his authority was ſo great, not only in the African church, but in the Latin church in general, that his reception of the Apocalypſe was what chiefly contributed to its almoſt univerſal admiſſion both in Africa, and in the Weſt of Europe. During the life of Auguſtin, was held in the year 397 the third council of Carthage; and this was the firſt council, in which the Apocalypſe was pronounced

[c] Lardner, Vol. X. p. 77. 100. 123.

[d] Ib. p. 211. 251, 252.

pronounced canonical*. But this ſame council, which upon the whole did not diſplay the moſt acute judgment, placed the following apocryphal books, the Wiſdom of Solomon, Eccleſiaſticus, Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees, in the ſacred canon: and therefore proteſtants cannot with propriety appeal to the decrees of this council, not even to that in favour of the Apocalypſe. Innocent I. who was elected Pope in the year 402, declared likewiſe that this book, from which his ſucceſſors were to be proved the Antichriſt, was canonical. Some few perſons however, even in the Latin church ſtill doubted of its authority, as appears from the twenty-ſeventh decree of the fourth council of Toledo, which was held in the year 633. In this decree, complaint is made of certain eccleſiaſtics, who refuſed to read the Apocalypſe in divine ſervice; and they who perſiſt in their refuſal are threatened with excommunication. At the ſame time the Apocalypſe is declared to be a genuine and divine work: and the reaſon aſſigned for this declaration is, that it had been pronounced ſuch by ſeveral councils, and by ſeveral Popes. But the good biſhops aſſembled at Toledo would have been reduced to great diſtreſs, if they had been required to name the ſeveral councils, in which the Apocalypſe had been pronounced canonical: for no other is known, than the above-mentioned third council of Carthage. A ſhort time after the fourth council of Toledo, all doubts in reſpect to the Apocalypſe vaniſhed in the Latin church: and it remained unimpeached till the time of the Reformation, when Luther called in queſtion the authority of this book, though it is ſuppoſed to propheſy in his favour, and to denounce vengeance againſt that very church of which he was an enemy. But in his opinion of the Apocalypſe Luther had very few followers.

Having related the fate of the Apocalypſe in the Greek and Latin churches, I muſt now mention the reception with which it met in the Syrian church, a church ſo very extenſive that it comprehended not only all

* Lardner, Vol. X. p. 192, 193.

all the Chriſtians, who reſided in Syria, Aſſyria, and Meſopotamia, but likewiſe all thoſe, who were diſperſed in Arabia, Perſia, Tartary, and China.

It has been already noted, that the Apocalypſe is not contained in the old Syriac verſion, which is the Vulgate of the Syrian church in general: and yet, as I have likewiſe obſerved, the Manicheans, whoſe original founder, Scythian, was a native of Arabia, and whoſe ſecond and proper founder, Manes, ſpake Syriac, but underſtood no Greek, conſequently could read the Apocalypſe only in a Syriac verſion, appear to have received the Apocalypſe. In this caſe we may conclude, that though the Apocalypſe made no part of the Syrian Vulgate, it was tranſlated in an early age into that language. But ſhall we therefore conclude, that the Syrian church admitted, that St. John the Apoſtle was the author of it: and if they had been perſuaded that he was, would not the Apocalypſe have made a part of the Syrian Vulgate, or ſacred canon? Haſſencamp [e] ſays in reply, that the Apocalypſe was written after the old Syriac verſion was already made, the former being in his opinion written in the year 96, the latter before that period: and conſequently that the Syrian canon omits the Apocalypſe, becauſe it was written after that canon was formed. But even if this reply be admitted, we ſhall render by it no ſervice to the Apocalypſe: for on the hypotheſis, that the Apocalypſe was written ſo late as the year 96, very material objections may be made to its divinity, as will be ſhewn in the ſection relative to the time when this book was written.

Ephrem, the Syrian, has not only quoted the Apocalypſe, but has quoted it as a divine work, of which the following paſſage in his Syriac works [f] is a proof. 'John ſaw in revelation a great and wonderful book, which God had written, and which was ſealed with ſeven ſeals.' Other paſſages of a like import, eſpecially ſome from thoſe works of Ephrem, which exiſt in a Greek

[e] In his Remarks on the latter part of my Introduction, p. 24. 26.
[f] Vol. II. p. 332.

Greek tranſlation, are collected by Haſſencamp in the above-mentioned treatiſe. From the opinion of Ephrem we may argue to that of the Syrian church in general in his time, and conclude that the Apocalypſe, of which a Syriac tranſlation muſt already have been made, was not only known to the members of that church, but received by them as a divine work.

In the ſeventh century a new and very literal Syriac tranſlation was made of the Apocalypſe, and taken into the Philoxenian verſion, which was chiefly uſed by the Monophyſites. Of this verſion I have treated at large in the ſecond volume of this Introduction[g]: and therefore I ſhall only obſerve at preſent, that as this verſion was uſed by the Monophyſites, they did not reject the Apocalypſe.

In the latter half of the ſame century, and in the beginning of the next, lived Jacob, the Monophyſite biſhop of Edeſſa[h]. He has quoted the Apocalypſe in his commentary on Geneſis, at ch. xlix. 17. The paſſage is in the firſt volume of [i] Ephrem's Syriac works, where is a Catena on Geneſis, formed of the commentaries of Ephrem and Jacob. The text of the Apocalypſe, which Jacob quotes, I have already collated with the text of the Philoxenian verſion[k]. In the ſecond edition of this Introduction I obſerved that Jacob aſcribed the Apocalypſe to 'one of the ſaints,' becauſe the words, which he has uſed, were 'this is the kingdom, of which one of the ſaints has ſpoken in a revelation from God:' and I declared that I was in doubt, whether he meant St. John the Apoſtle, or whether he entertained the ſame ſentiments, as Dionyſius of Alexandria[l]. Haſſencamp however contends that he really meant St. John the Apoſtle,

[g] Ch. vii. Sect. 10.

[h] It appears from Aſſemani Bibl. Orient. Tom. II. p. 337, that he died in the year 1019 of the Greek era, that is, in the year of Chriſt 708.

[i] Pag. 192.

[k] Ch. vii. Sect. 10.

[l] See Sect. 2. of this Chapter.

Apoſtle, becauſe preſently after, Jacob adds, 'that this relates to the Roman Empire, as the Holy Ghoſt has taught by the biſhop and martyr Hippolytus, where he explains the Revelation made to John, who ſpeaks the word of God.' But this argument is in my opinion by no means ſatisfactory: for the expreſſion 'John who ſpeaks the words of God' denotes nothing more than Johannes theologus, as Aſſeman has rightly tranſlated it. But whether Johannes theologus was the ſame perſon as Johannes apoſtolus, is a queſtion on which the ancients were divided: and they who received the Apocalypſe as a ſacred book, but denied that St. John the Apoſtle was the author of it, carefully obſerved this diſtinction. Beſides, if Jacob had really meant St. John the Apoſtle, he would hardly have called him, as in the firſt of the preceding quotations, by ſo indeterminate a title, as that of 'one of the ſaints.'

That the Syrians of the Neſtorian party received likewiſe the Apocalypſe in the eighth century, appears from an ancient monument, which was dug up at Sanxuen in the Chineſe province of Xenſi in the year 1625. This monument has two inſcriptions, the one in Chineſe characters, the other in Syriac, from which it appears that it was erected in the year of the Greeks 1092, that is, in the year of Chriſt 781: at which period, as well as ſome centuries later, was a very numerous colony of Neſtorian Syrians in China, who regularly received their biſhops from the Neſtorian Patriarch. And on this monument mention is made of the New Teſtament as containing twenty-ſeven books: conſequently the Apocalypſe muſt have been included in the number. It was formerly ſuſpected to have been a forgery of the Jeſuits; but Haſſencamp has in my opinion ſatisfactorily ſhown that the monument is really ancient and genuine[m].

Dionyſius

[m] See § 7, of his remarks, where the hiſtory of this remarkable monument is related, and ſo much of its inſcription quoted as is neceſſary for the preſent.

Dionyſius Barſalibæus, a celebrated Monophyſite biſhop of Amida at the end of the eleventh century, wrote an Expoſition of the Apocalypſe, as Haſſencamp has ſhown from Pococke's preface to his edition of the Syriac verſion of the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, the ſecond and third Epiſtles of St. John, and the Epiſtle of St. Jude. And this is further confirmed by Aſſeman, Bibl. Orient. Tom. II. p. 210.

On the other hand, Gregorius Barhebræus, or, as he is likewiſe called Abulpharagius, who was Primate of all the Monophyſites of the Eaſt in the thirteenth century[n], and was by far the moſt learned of all the Syrian writers, appears, as Aſſeman[o] has obſerved, to have rejected the Apocalypſe: for where he ſpeaks of it in his Nomocanon, he does nothing more than quote the opinion of Dionyſius of Alexandria, and in the following words: 'The Apocalypſe, which bears the name of the Apoſtle John, is not his work, but the work either of Cerinthus, who taught that there would be eating and drinking upon earth after the reſurrection, or of another John; for two perſons of the name of John lie buried in Epheſus.' The Monophyſites or Jacobites therefore did not receive the Apocalypſe unanimouſly[p].

Ebedjeſu, Metropolitan of Armenia, who died in the year[q] 1318, has in his catalogue of the ſacred books, which compoſe the New Teſtament, entirely omitted the Apocalypſe[r], though he afterwards takes notice of the work, which Hippolytus had written in its defence. Aſſeman relates alſo, that neither the Jacobites nor the Neſtorians read the Apocalypſe in their churches, and that

[n] He died in the year 1286.

[o] Bibl. Orient. Tom. III. P. I. p. 15. not. 5.

[p] Haſſencamp replies, p. 17, that the paſſage quoted from Dionyſius is ambiguous, and that Dionyſius may poſſibly mean ſome Apocalypſe different from that which is in our canon. Whether he does, or does not, I leave the reader to determine.

[q] Aſſemani Bibl. Orient. Tom. III. P. I. p. 3. not. 3.

[r] Ib. p. 12.

that it is not contained in their manuſcripts of the New Teſtament. He adds, however, that this is no certain proof that the Neſtorians wholly rejected the Apocalypſe, ſince it may ariſe merely from the circumſtance, that it is not contained in the Syrian Vulgate. Of the Maronite Syrians it is unneceſſary to mention that they receive the Apocalypſe: for as they acknowledge the ſupremacy of the Pope, they of courſe can reject no book which has been canonized by the church of Rome. The Egyptian Chriſtians likewiſe receive the Apocalypſe.

I now come to the opinion of the Lutheran church, which, though it is much too modern, to be of any weight in determining the main queſtion, is in other reſpects of importance to thoſe who are members of the church. Luther, though accuſtomed from his childhood to conſider the Apocalypſe, as one of the canonical books of the New Teſtament, rejected it in poſitive terms in the preface [s] to his edition of 1522. This preface Luther afterwards omitted, and in the later editions ſubſtituted a preface [t], in which he expreſſed himſelf in leſs deciſive terms, and left it to others, who, he ſays, were better qualified than himſelf, to determine whether it merited a place in the ſacred canon, or not. It does not appear that Luther diſcovered new arguments in favour of the Apocalypſe after he had written the firſt preface; at leaſt a compariſon of the two prefaces affords no reaſon to think ſo. He was probably influenced by the ſame motives as thoſe which were avowed by Dionyſius of Alexandria [u]: and, as the Apocalypſe was highly eſteemed by the generality of his brethren, who, like himſelf had renounced the church of Rome, he would not abſolutely reject it, but ſubſtituted a dubious for a more deciſive tone, that he might give the leſs offence to

[s] An extract from this preface has been already given in the firſt ſection of this chapter.

[t] An extract from this preface likewiſe has been given in the ſame ſection.

[u] Sect. 2 of this chapter.

to the reſt of his party. Who the perſons were, on whoſe account in particular Luther altered his preface, I do not know: and I wiſh that the records of our reformation were more cloſely examined with a view to this ſubject. In general however we may aſſert as an indiſputable fact, that almoſt all the proſelytes to Luther's doctrine had been accuſtomed from their childhood to conſider the Apocalypſe as a prophetical book, and that the Franciſcans in particular, many of whom embraced Lutheraniſm, had begun ſo early as the thirteenth century to teach the doctrine, that the enemy of the ſaints, foretold in the Apocalypſe, was the Pope.

But, whatever alterations Luther thought proper to make in his original preface, he deviated only ſo far from it, that he left the matter in doubt: nor do I know of any paſſage in any of his works, in which he has given it as his opinion, that the Apocalypſe was canonical. Our Symbolic books likewiſe leave the queſtion undecided. It is true, that at the beginning of the Formula Concordiæ, 'the prophetical and apoſtolical writings of the Old and New Teſtament' are commanded to be believed, and to be received as the only rule of faith: but ſince it is a matter of doubt, whether the Apocalypſe was written by an Apoſtle or not, and this very doubt is expreſſed in the preface prefixed to it in our Lutheran Bibles, it is evident that the Formula Concordiæ enjoins no rule in regard to its reception. Should any one object that the authors of the Formula Concordiæ meant by the term 'apoſtolical writings,' ſuch writings as the ancient councils had declared canonical, I would anſwer that even in that caſe the term does not neceſſarily include the Apocalypſe, becauſe the ancient councils were not unanimous in reſpect to its canonical authority. The council of Laodicea itſelf may be here alleged as an inſtance: for, though the ſixtieth canon of this council has lately been called in queſtion, yet at that time when the Formula Concordiæ was drawn up, no one had the leaſt doubt of its authenticity. Further, the Apocalypſe is not once quoted in the Formula Concordiæ, as every one

one will find on conſulting the index annexed to it in Rechenberg's edition. When therefore the greater part of the Lutheran divines refer the Apocalypſe, without doubt or ſcruple, to the claſs of canonical writings of the New Teſtament, this is the reſult only of private opinion, and not of any deciſion made by the church. For the Lutheran church, as a law-giving body, has enacted no decree, which enjoins a belief in the Apocalypſe: and therefore, if any of its members ſhould doubt, or even deny the authenticity of the Apocalypſe, it would be highly unjuſt to accuſe them of heterodoxy. On the contrary, if it were allowable to argue from inferences, which may be drawn from the Symbolic books, the authority of the Apocalypſe would be rather diminiſhed than increaſed: for in the Symbolic books the doctrine of the Millennium is expreſsly condemned, and yet the Apocalypſe, if we explain it literally, certainly contains this doctrine. But as it would be unfair to argue either on the one ſide or on the other, where nothing is expreſsly determined, we muſt reſt ſatisfied that our Symbolic books, like Luther's laſt preface, leave the deciſion of the queſtion to every man's private judgment.

SECT. V.

Of the completion or non-completion of the prophecies contained in the Apocalypſe, conſidered in reſpect to the arguments which they afford in favour of, or againſt its divinity.

THOUGH the teſtimonies of the ancients muſt decide the queſtion, whether a book aſcribed to any particular perſon, was really written by that perſon or not, yet when a book lays claim to prophecy, and the

queſtion is agitated, not whether this or that Apoſtle wrote it, but in general whether it was inſpired by the Deity, there is another method of coming to a deciſion, which we in the eighteenth century may apply, but which was not applicable in the earlieſt ages of Chriſtianity. We have only to inquire, whether the prophecies contained in it have been fulfilled. If they have not been fulfilled, we muſt conſider the work as a mere production of the human imagination: but on the other hand, if it be certain that they have been fulfilled, we have an infallible criterion, from which we may at once, and without any further critical inquiries, pronounce in favour of its divinity.

Here however an almoſt inſuperable difficulty preſents itſelf at the very outſet, and that is, the difficulty of determining what the prophecies in the Apocalypſe really mean: for that which by one commentator is conſidered as fulfilled, and is accordingly quoted as a proof that the Apocalypſe is divine, has according to another commentator not yet received its completion. For inſtance, Vitringa contends that certain prophecies are completed, which Lange abſolutely denies: and Bengel again differs from both. Nor is this the caſe with theſe three only; for among one hundred commentators hardly any one is ſatisfied with the explanations of his predeceſſors. Each man imagines that he alone has diſcovered the true meaning, which had eſcaped the penetration of thoſe who had gone before him: and after having read the various commentaries, which have been written on the Apocalypſe, one is almoſt inclined to believe that each commentator is ſo far in the right, when he ſays that all others are in the wrong. I remember ſoon after the foundation of the Univerſity of Göttingen, that Heumann and Oporin read lectures there at the ſame time on the Apocalypſe. Oporin, a man of great modeſty and diffidence, ſpoke of Heumann's learning and general good ſenſe in terms of the higheſt approbation: but always made an exception to the lectures on the Apocalypſe, ſaying, 'that is Heumann's weak ſide.' Heumann, on the

the other hand, in many reſpects did juſtice to Oporin: but when he came to ſpeak of the Apocalypſe, he lamented that Oporin ſhould attempt to read lectures on a book, of which he did not comprehend the meaning. About the ſame time, in the Univerſity of Halle, Dr. Lange, a friend of Heumann, had again a very different ſyſtem, of the truth of which he was ſo perſuaded, that he uſed to aſſure his pupils, he was the firſt commentator who had delivered the Apocalypſe from the torture. It is unneceſſary to mention more names: for every man may eaſily convince himſelf merely by conſulting the different commentaries, that the commentators in general are at variance[w]. In fact he have no connected and unforced commentary on the Apocalypſe, in which the agreement between hiſtorical events and the predictions of the Apocalypſe have been clearly and diſtinctly explained. Even the immortal Newton, the greateſt genius of modern ages, who with powers almoſt divine diſcovered the eternal laws which the Almighty had preſcribed to his creation, has afforded in his attempt on the Apocalypſe, in which he was not more ſucceſsful than his predeceſſors, a mortifying proof of the weakneſs of human nature.

If it be objected, that the prophecies in the Apocalypſe are not yet fulfilled, that they are therefore not fully underſtood, and that hence ariſes the difference of opinion in reſpect to their meaning, I anſwer, that if theſe prophecies are not yet fulfilled, it is wholly impoſſible that the Apocalypſe ſhould be a divine work, ſince the author expreſsly declares, ch. i. 1, that it contains 'things, which muſt *ſhortly* come to paſs.' Conſequently, either a great part of them, I will not ſay all, muſt have been fulfilled, or the author's declaration, that they ſhould ſhortly

[w] I mean original commentators, or thoſe who have acted for themſelves, and cannot be ſuppoſed to include all thoſe who implicitly adopt the ſyſtems delivered in ſchools, in which they have been educated. That the clergyman in the Dutchy of Würterberg, for inſtance, who maintained that the angel flying in the midſt of heaven, Apoc. xiv, denoted Bengel, adopted Bengel's ſyſtem, is a thing of courſe.

ſhortly be completed is not conſiſtent with matter of fact. It is true, that to the Almighty a thouſand years are as one day, and one day as a thouſand years: but if we therefore explain the term 'ſhortly' as denoting a period longer than that which has elapſed ſince the time when the Apocalypſe was written, we ſacrifice the love of truth to the ſupport of a preconceived opinion. For when the Deity condeſcends to communicate information to mankind, he will of courſe uſe ſuch language as is intelligible to mankind, and not name a period ſhort, which all men conſider as long; or the communication will be totally uſeleſs. Beſides, in reference to God's eternity, not only ſeventeen hundred, but ſeventeen thouſand years are nothing. But the author of the Apocalypſe himſelf has wholly precluded any ſuch evaſion by explaining, ch. i. 3, what he meant by the term 'ſhortly:' for he there ſays, 'Bleſſed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this propheſy, and keep thoſe things which are written therein, for the time is at hand.' According therefore to the author's own declaration, the Apocalypſe contained prophecies, with which the very perſons to whom it was ſent were immediately concerned. But if none of theſe prophecies were deſigned to be completed till long after their death, thoſe perſons were not immediately concerned with them; and the author would ſurely not have ſaid, that they were bleſſed in reading prophecies, of which the time was at hand, if thoſe prophecies were not to be fulfilled till after a lapſe of many ages.

SECT. VI.

Whether the contradictory explanations, which have been hitherto given of the Apocalypſe, ought to be aſcribed to the Apocalypſe itſelf, or to a want of knowledge in the commentators.

WHEN a work which lays claim to prophecy, and of which the author declares, that the prophecies contained in it will ſhortly begin to be completed, ſtill remains after a lapſe of ſeventeen centuries ſo difficult to be underſtood, that commentators cannot agree as to its meaning, it is difficult to avoid ſuſpecting, that the claim of ſuch a book is ungrounded: and I confeſs that theſe very contradictions in the explanation of it are ſtill more unfavourable to it, than the ancient teſtimonies before the time of Euſebius. On the other hand it muſt be admitted, that, even when it is certain that a work contains divine prophecies, our own ignorance may be ſuch that we are unable to explain them. For inſtance, the prophecies of Iſaiah and Jeremiah relating to Edom, Moab, and Ammon, we are unable to explain from real hiſtory: but this circumſtance excites no ſuſpicion againſt their divinity, becauſe the hiſtory of the Edomites, the Moabites, and the Ammonites, for ſeveral centuries, is totally unknown to us. And that the commentators on the Apocalypſe, even the moſt learned of them, have been deficient in qualifications, which every commentator on this book ought to poſſeſs, muſt likewiſe be granted.

In the firſt place every man, who attempts to comment on a work, muſt be complete maſter of the language in which it is written. Now the Apocalypſe, though written in Greek, is at the ſame time full of Hebraiſms*: its

* No book in the whole New Teſtament has ſo many Hebraiſms as the Apocalypſe.

its language is figurative, and the figures have reference to Jewiſh cuſtoms: and the whole work has manifeſtly the form and manner of an oriental compoſition. Conſequently an interpreter of the Apocalypſe muſt, with a knowledge of the Greek, unite a knowledge both of the oriental languages and of oriental antiquities: for mere Hebrew philology, or ſuch as is derived only from the ſtudy of the Hebrew Bible, and the uſe of a Hebrew Lexicon, is inſufficient. But the commentators on the Apocalypſe, eſpecially thoſe who have taken the lead, and have ſet the faſhion to others, have for the moſt part been very deficient in this neceſſary qualification, and moreover have been biaſſed with prejudices, which are not well adapted to a diſcovery of the truth. Thus the Franciſcans in the middle ages explained many paſſages of the Apocalypſe as denouncing vengeance to the Pope, becauſe they were proſcribed by Papal authority: the Lutherans diſcovered in it prophecies againſt the church, from which they had withdrawn: and in the laſt century the reformers in France irritated by the revocation of the edict of Nantes found the means of conſolation in the Apocalypſe, by explaining it to the diſadvantage of their perſecutors. Hence have ariſen commentaries, in which others have implicitly confided. But to return to the neceſſary philological qualifications in an interpreter of the Apocalypſe, which, it is certain, have fallen to the lot of very few. The late Dr. Lange for inſtance, though a very zealous commentator on the Apocalypſe, was poſſeſſed of very little knowledge of the oriental languages: and Bengel, though upon the whole a very accurate and very reſpectable critic, had never made oriental philology his particular ſtudy. An exception may perhaps be made in favour of Vitringa: but even Vitringa did not poſſeſs oriental philology in its full extent, for he was unacquainted with Arabic, without which it is impoſſible to be complete maſter of the Hebrew. Yet his merits are very great: and, if he had not been a diſciple of Cocceius, might not have known more of the Apocalypſe than moſt other interpreters. Lately, however, Wetſtein and

Harenberg have applied a very conſiderable fund of Jewiſh literature to the explanation of the Apocalypſe: the former in his edition of the Greek Teſtament, the latter ſtill more amply in his Expoſition of the Revelation of St. John, publiſhed at Brunſwick in 1759, a work, in which the quoted paſſages, and the tranſlations given of thoſe paſſages, betray however a few inſtances of partiality for the author's ſyſtem. But Wetſtein and Harenberg have not ſet the faſhion to others: on the contrary, the latter, if I am not miſtaken, is very little read. As to moſt other commentators and tranſlators of the Apocalypſe, it muſt be confeſſed that they have been frequently guilty of almoſt inconceivable abſurdities: nor do I except even thoſe, who, ſetting aſide all prophetical explanations, have confined themſelves to literal and grammatical interpretation. But whoever fails in the grammatical interpretation of a book will hardly ſucceed in diſcovering the author's meaning[y].

A ſecond qualification, which an interpreter of the Apocalypſe ought to poſſeſs, is a taſte for poetry and painting; for in the Apocalypſe, notwithſtanding its uncouth Greek, we meet with very fine deſcription. But when a viſion is well repreſented, the rules of poetry and painting are uſually obſerved, and conſequently ſome knowledge of theſe arts is requiſite, in order to underſtand the repreſentation. Thus, if a painter deſigned to repreſent a dream, occaſioned by the particular interpoſition of Divine Providence, he would paint an angel ſtanding by the bed of the perſon who had the dream: and this he might do, without intending to ſignify, as a dog-

y To mention only one inſtance of falſe tranſlation. Each of the twelve gates of the New Jeruſalem conſiſted (according to the common tranſlation) of one pearl. Now a pearl, whether we conſider the rotundity of its figure, or the ſoftneſs of its maſs, is very ill qualified to become the gate of a city, even if that city exiſts only in poetical deſcription. The word uſed in the Greek is μαργαριτης, and this ought to be rendered 'precious ſtone,' for this is the meaning aſcribed to the word in Chaldee, in which language it was adopted and written מרגליתא. A gate built of precious ſtones preſents an image both of ſtrength, and of magnificence. Μαργαριτης is uſed perhaps in the ſame ſenſe, Matth. xiii. 45, 46.

a dogmatical truth, that an angel in a bodily ſhape really deſcended to that perſon, and inſpired the dream. In like manner the angels, which act ſo conſiderable a part in the Apocalypſe, may be conſidered as poetical imagery, unleſs we ſuppoſe that its author intended to convert into articles of faith the fabulous notion of the Jews, that every land and every element had its peculiar angel. This is only one inſtance out of many, which might be alleged. But among the commentators on the Apocalypſe, where ſhall we find one, who had a proper taſte for the explanation of poetical repreſentation? It is true, that Peterſen poſſeſſed a poetical genius; but then he was a poet who did not underſtand the rules of the art, and interpreted the Apocalypſe much more literally than he himſelf ever wrote. When an ancient poet ſays,

> 'Euphrates ibat jam mollior undis,'

or a modern poet,

> 'At thy approach the Rhine withdrew it's waves,
> 'And left its bed, to let the conqu'ror paſs,'

no one would take this paſſage in a ſtrict and literal ſenſe: but Peterſen always underſtood Apoc. xvi. 12. as ſignifying that the waters of the Euphrates were really and literally dried up. The firſt time I heard of this literal explanation was, when I was a boy at Halle, and happened to be one day in company with Peterſen: but even at that time, though I had no very clear and diſtinct notions on the ſubject, the drying up of the Euphrates, that the kings of the Eaſt might paſs it, appeared to me at leaſt an unneceſſary miracle.

The third and moſt important requiſite is a complete knowledge of hiſtory, eſpecially the hiſtory of Aſia. A general knowledge of hiſtory is by no means ſufficient; it muſt be a knowledge which deſcends to the moſt minute particulars; for a propheſy, in which neither perſon nor place is named, we can underſtand only by knowing the diſtinguiſhing circumſtances of thoſe events to which it relates. Great events, ſuch as battles, political

litical revolutions, religious perſecutions, when examined only at large, are for the moſt part ſo ſimilar to each other, that, without names and dates, it is difficult to diſtinguiſh them. At leaſt there is hardly any great event, to which there is not ſomething in hiſtory which bears reſemblance, and with which, therefore, it might poſſibly be confounded, when all diſtinctions of geography and chronology are ſet aſide, unleſs we know the more minute circumſtances, which diſtinguiſh the one from the other. Two battles fought by the French, the one in 1513, the other in 1757, have a great reſemblance to each other, though in importance they were very unlike. Suppoſe, then, that theſe two battles were repreſented in painting, and that ſome ages hence, when the preſent military dreſs, modern tactics, and plans of attack, which to us would eaſily diſtinguiſh the one engagement from the other, the two paintings ſhould be put into the hands of a perſon unacquainted with theſe particulars, he would be at a loſs to determine which of the two paintings repreſented the one, and which the other engagement. And every one who has viſited galleries of hiſtorical paintings, knows how difficult it is, without a very particular knowledge of hiſtory, to paſs through the gallery, without being at a loſs in diſcovering the meaning of the ſubjects.

But the commentators on the Apocalypſe are ſo far from having poſſeſſed a complete knowledge of hiſtory, that the greateſt part of them have diſplayed only a moderate ſhare of it. Vitringa, perhaps, will here likewiſe be mentioned as an exception; but among the commentators on the Apocalypſe we can reckon only one Vitringa, and even Vitringa's hiſtorical knowledge was not ſufficiently extenſive. The ancient hiſtory before the birth of Chriſt is foreign to our preſent purpoſe; and the hiſtory of the ſeventeen laſt centuries was underſtood by Vitringa, in its full extent, only ſo far as it relates to Europe. But we cannot expect that prophecies, addreſſed to ſeven communities in Aſia Minor, ſhould be fulfilled only in Europe, or in the Latin church.

church. Chriſtianity flouriſhed under the Eaſtern, as well as under the Weſtern Emperors: it was propagated likewiſe in Arabia, in Perſia, in the great Tartary from the Caſpian Sea to the borders of China, and even in China itſelf. Aſia has been the ſeat of the moſt important revolutions with which the hiſtory of Chriſtianity is cloſely connected. In Aſia was founded the religion of Mohammed; and out of Aſia emerged the Saracens, the Turks, and the Tartars. Whoever, therefore, is not acquainted with the Conſtantinopolitan and Aſiatic hiſtories of theſe nations, is by no means qualified to become an interpreter of the Apocalypſe. But among all who have ventured to interpret it, not one can boaſt of this thorough acquaintance; and the principal reaſon is, that the beſt accounts of the Saracens, the Turks, and the Tartars, are contained in Syriac and Arabic authors, which very few hiſtorians can read in the original, and of which we have either no tranſlations at all, or not ſuch as an hiſtorian can appeal to as to an original document [z].

Further, as moſt men are acquainted with the hiſtory of their own country, and this hiſtory always appears of ſo much the more importance, in proportion as we know the leſs of the hiſtory of other countries, the interpreters of the Apocalypſe have ſought at home for the completion of its prophecies: and as prophetical deſcriptions, without either names or dates, are applicable to various events, each interpreter has found, in a great part of the Apocalypſe, the hiſtory of his own country. And when we conſider that the paſſion for this mode of interpretation has been variouſly modified, ſometimes by religious zeal and a ſpirit of perſecution, at other times by

[z] It muſt be admitted, however, that even they who were better acquainted with the Conſtantinopolitan and Arabic hiſtories than we are, did not meet with better ſucceſs. For Barhebræus, the moſt celebrated hiſtorian of the Eaſt, who lived in the reign of the great Tartarian conqueror Hulac, and was himſelf a witneſs of very important revolutions, doubted the divinity of the Apocalypſe. Conſequently he did not perceive any correſpondence between the prophecies of the Apocalypſe and the Aſiatic hiſtory.

by a ſenſe of oppreſſion and enmity to the ruling church, we need not wonder that the commentaries on the Apocalypſe have aſſumed ſuch various ſhapes, that what is affirmed as indiſputably true in the one, is as flatly contradicted in the other.

SECT. VII.

Further remarks on the different Expoſitions of the Apocalypſe.

THE compaſs of the preſent work does not permit me to examine in detail the various expoſitions, which have been given of the Apocalypſe: but this I will affirm in general terms, that of all the commentaries on it, which I have hitherto ſeen, not one has given me ſatisfaction. I confeſs likewiſe, that out of all the commentaries put together, I am unable to make one which is better.

Thus much, however, I perceive, that if the Apocalypſe is a divine book, the beginning of its prophecies *muſt* relate to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem: and that it *may* relate to that event, provided the work was written before the Jewiſh war. In this caſe the ſixth chapter may be explained as a propheſy, both of the kingdom of the Meſſiah (ver. 2.), and of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem itſelf: but then the ſecond, third, and fourth ſeals cannot denote events, which followed each other, but events which happened at the ſame time, each of which is ſeparately repreſented, in order to make out the myſtical number ſeven. The ſeventh ſeal may relate to the deliverance of the faithful among the Jews, who fled to Pella: and ch. viii. 1, may denote the conſequent ſecurity which the church enjoyed in that city. On the

the other hand, if the ſixth and ſeventh chapters be ſuppoſed to refer to later events, the firſt readers of the Apocalypſe, to whom the work was immediately ſent, muſt have been ſo very little intereſted in them, that the author could hardly have ſaid, ch. i. 3, 'Bleſſed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this propheſy, and keep thoſe things which are written therein: for the time is at hand.'

What follows from ch. viii. 2, to ch. ix. 12, is to me ſo obſcure, that I cannot even hazard a conjecture: but ch. ix. 13—17, contains a deſcription which may be very well applied to the irruption of the Saracens, the Turks, and the Tartars, and to thoſe ages, in which one horde of barbarians after another emerged from the Eaſt, and with irreſiſtible fury over-ran the Weſt. I think it likewiſe not improbable, that the moſt ancient explanation of the myſtical number 666 is the true one, according to which the word ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ is denoted; the Greek letters in this name, when taken as numerals, making out preciſely the number in queſtion. Nor will I aſſert that proteſtant commentators are miſtaken, in explaining the 'whore drunken with the blood of the martyrs,' not of heathen Rome, which was converted, and became not a heap of ruins according to the deſcription given in ch. xviii, but of the church of Rome, the capital of which may one day, perhaps, meet with this fate. At the ſame time, however, I muſt confeſs, that in all the chapters which relate to the beaſt and the whore, I can diſcover no marks, which indicate that the beaſt and the whore are to be ſought in the church: on the contrary, if we may judge from the deſcription given of them in the Apocalypſe, one ſhould ſuppoſe that they related to an heathen city and empire.

But if it be admitted that certain chapters of the Apocalypſe are capable of the moſt ſatisfactory explanation, there are other intermediate chapters, which are ſo obſcure, that to me, at leaſt, the chain of prophecy is broken. It is not ſufficient, that we diſcover a reſemblance between a few detached paſſages and ſome ſingle hiſtorical

hiſtorical events: for any prophecy, however falſe upon the whole, (take that of Drabicius for inſtance) may have ſomething in it, which has the appearance of being fulfilled. Beſides, the fourteenth chapter itſelf affords a ſtrong argument, that the explanation above given of the ſeventh chapter is inaccurate. For the hundred and forty-four thouſand, mentioned in the fourteenth chapter as having the Father's name written on their foreheads, appear to be the very ſame as the hundred and forty-four thouſand, who are deſcribed as ſealed in the ſeventh chapter: and we have no reaſon to conclude, from the fourteenth chapter, that they were perſons whoſe juſtification was completed, and who were become inhabitants of heaven. But the Jews, who fled to Pella, did not live ſo late as the time to which I ſhould be obliged to refer the fourteenth chapter: nor did their poſterity ſo long continue to be a ſeparate community.

Further, if the ſixth and ſeventh chapters of the Apocalypſe really relate to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, it will be found, on examination,

1. That they contain nothing which had not been already foretold by Chriſt and the prophet Daniel. Conſequently, though it were true that the Apocalypſe was written before the commencement of the Jewiſh war, the completion of this prophecy would afford no argument that the Apocalypſe was written by inſpiration, becauſe the author of it might have derived his information from preceding prophecies. Thus, if any man in the preſent age ſhould foretel the converſion of the Jews, the completion of that prophecy would not prove that he was a real prophet, ſince he might have taken it from the Epiſtles of St. Paul.

2. That, though the deſcription in the Apocalypſe is much more pompous, it is not ſo circumſtantial as thoſe of Chriſt and Daniel. It takes no notice of the attack of Ceſtius Gallus, to which Chriſt, with a warning voice to his faithful diſciples, very clearly alludes: it contains nothing about Titus Veſpaſian, who is characterized by

Daniel, and nothing of the circumſtances likewiſe foretold by Daniel, that the war would laſt ſeven years, and that in the midſt of this period the ſacrifices would ceaſe. Now in a revelation made by Chriſt himſelf, a ſhort time only before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, one might reaſonably expect that the deſcription of this event would contain more circumſtances than the prophecy which he had formerly delivered: but ſince this is not the caſe with the prophecy in the Apocalypſe, one cannot avoid doubting whether it really did proceed from Chriſt.

3. That, in order to make out the myſtical number ſeven, events, which happened nearly at the ſame time, are divided into the ſecond, third, and fourth ſeals. Now this ſeems wholly unneceſſary for a writer who was acquainted with the circumſtances of the Jewiſh war, whether his information was prophetical, or only hiſtorical. And an author, who was determined to adhere to the number ſeven, might very properly have ſought it in the ſeven years propheſied by Daniel. The hiſtory of the war itſelf likewiſe furniſhes ſeven remarkable dates, which are well adapted to the purpoſe.—1. The offering of birds at the entrance into a ſynagogue at Cæſarea, made in order to irritate the Jews, an event, which, though trifling in itſelf, afforded an occaſion for the breaking out of the Jewiſh war. 2. The ſeizure of the principal fortreſs Maſada by the banditti. 3. The campaign of Ceſtius Gallus. 4. The irruption of the greater army under Veſpaſian. 5. The ſiege and conqueſt of Jeruſalem, with the famine[a] which preceded it's ſurrender. 6. The retaking of Maſada, or rather the

[a] Ch. vi. 6, can have no reference to the famine in Jeruſalem: for when a chœnix of wheat coſt a denarius, it may be ſaid that wheat was dear, but not that there was a famine. A chœnix contained as much wheat as was neceſſary for the ſupport of one day, and a common labourer could earn a denarius every day: the account, therefore, contained in this verſe, may be applied to the ſcarcity which happened in the reign of Claudius (Joſeph. Antiq. xx. 2. 6. Acts xi. 28, 29. Matth. xxiv. 7), but it is wholly inapplicable to the dreadful famine, which preceded the ſurrender of Jeruſalem. It was ſaid likewiſe, in ch. vi. 6, that the oil and the wine ſhould not be hurt: but this was hardly the caſe, when Jeruſalem was reduced to the utmoſt diſtreſs.

the ſelf-murder of the whole Jewiſh garriſon contained in it, which Joſephus conſiders as the cloſe of the war. 7. The laſt remains of the war in Egypt and Libya. But of theſe events, what is very extraordinary, no uſe is made in the Apocalyſe.

SECT. VIII.

The ſame ſubject continued.

IT would really be worth while to write a particular hiſtory of the expoſitions of the Apocalypſe, and to ſhew in what manner the moſt ancient interpretation of it was gradually forſaken, in what manner the modern interpretation of it took its riſe among Proteſtants, and how this interpretation has ſpread into ſo many different branches. But as this would be an undertaking too extenſive for the preſent work, I will briefly obſerve, that the various expoſitions of the Apocalypſe may be arranged under the following claſſes.

1. To the firſt claſs may be referred all thoſe commentaries, which are faſhionable among proteſtants, and according to which the Apocalypſe contains prophecies againſt the Pope and the church of Rome. In the commentaries belonging to this claſs, the prophecies in the Apocalypſe are conſidered as ſtill fulfilling.

They have found, however, two powerful adverſaries in Webſter and Harenberg, whoſe objections, eſpecially thoſe of the latter, merit conſideration. It is true, that not all Webſter's arguments on this ſubject are ſatisfactory: for inſtance, that in which he ſays, that the Franciſcans, perſecuted by papal authority, were the firſt perſons who diſcovered in the Apocalypſe prophecies againſt the Pope; but that it is very improbable, that

ignorant monks of the middle ages ſhould have been the firſt to find the true key to ſo difficult a book. I grant, that as the monks of the middle ages had little or no knowledge of hiſtory, they could not have explained prophecies which were fulfilled long before their time: but if a prophecy was completed in their own time, they might have underſtood it better than the moſt learned men of former ages. The very preſſure under which the Franciſcans, and other diſſatisfied members of the church, at that time laboured, added to the corruption of the church, muſt have rendered ſuch a prophecy more intelligible to them, than it could have been to the moſt enlightened commentators before it was fulfilled. Another of Webſter's objections is, that whoever follows the Franciſcans, in interpreting the beaſt of the Pope, ought, in order to be conſiſtent, to follow them alſo in believing that the fratres ſpirituales formed the only true church. Now this objection is unreaſonable; for it is ſurely allowable to adopt one part of an interpretation, and reject the other.

But a very material objection to the commentaries of this claſs may be founded on the third part of the firſt chapter. The greateſt part of the prophecies in the Apocalypſe relate to the ſufferings of the church and the puniſhment of its adverſaries: and in the twentieth chapter is deſcribed the happy kingdom of a thouſand years, which was to put an end to all former ſorrows. When, therefore, the prophet ſays, at the beginning of his work, 'Bleſſed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep thoſe things which are written therein, for the time is at hand,' every man would ſuppoſe, unleſs he were already biaſſed by commentators, that ſome at leaſt of thoſe readers to whom the book was delivered and recommended, would live to ſee the happy period of the prophecy or the millennium. For how can a reader be called bleſſed, who ſees nothing but the perſecution of the faithful, and the downfall of ſtates? Yet, on a compariſon of the twentieth with the preceding chapters, it appears evident

evident that the deſtruction of Babylon, and of the beaſt, was to take place before the commencement of the millennium.

2. To the ſecond claſs belong thoſe commentaries, which confine the prophecies of the Apocalypſe to the three firſt centuries, at leaſt ſuch as relate to perſecution and puniſhment; for the happy Millennium may, according to theſe commentaries, be made to commence with the converſion of Conſtantine the Great.

The objection grounded on ch. i. 3, and on the Millennium, may be made likewiſe to the commentaries of this claſs.

3. A third claſs of commentators find in the Apocalypſe nothing but the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the flight of the Chriſtians from that city to Pella before the commencement of the ſiege. This interpretation has been ſupported by Harenberg, in his Expoſition of the Apocalypſe, publiſhed in 1759: and, in order to avoid the objection, that a prophecy relating only to Jeruſalem was not a proper work to be dedicated to ſeven churches in Aſia Minor, he contends that the ſeven churches mentioned in the Apocalypſe denoted ſeven ſynagogues in Jeruſalem, which were called the ſynagogue of Epheſus, the ſynagogue of Smyrna, of Laodicea, &c. becauſe they were reſpectively built by the inhabitants of thoſe cities, who frequented Jeruſalem. Now as, according to this interpretation, the prophecies were fulfilled in a ſhort time, agreeably to ch. i. 3, I ſhould be diſpoſed to adopt it, if difficulties of another kind did not preſent themſelves as obſtacles to its reception. To mention only one: 'That great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth,' mentioned ch. xvii. 18, can hardly denote Jeruſalem; for it clearly characterizes Rome, and is, as it were, the name of that great capital.

Laſtly, if the Apocalypſe were explained without previouſly ſuppoſing that it was a divine work, an interpretation might be made of a totally different turn from any of the preceding. In this caſe, as it is not taken

for granted, that the Apocalyyſe contains prophecies which have been really fulfilled, we ſhould have to inquire, not what events in hiſtory had reſemblance to viſions in the Apocalypſe, but merely what the author of this work propoſed to himſelf in the deſcription of the viſions, what events he himſelf ſuppoſed would happen, and what expectations the readers of this work, in the age when it was written, probably formed from it. But this is an inquiry which I have never inſtituted, and therefore I cannot ſay what would be the reſult.

SECT. IX.

Of the time when the Apocalypſe was written.

FROM what has been already ſaid in the ſixth ſection of this chapter, it appears that the queſtion, at what time the Apocalypſe was written, very materially concerns the queſtion, whether it be a divine work. For if its firſt prophecies relate to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, it muſt have been written before the Jewiſh war: but if the author of it wrote after the Jewiſh war, and, as is commonly ſuppoſed, in the reign of Domitian, the ſixth chapter of the Apocalypſe cannot poſſibly predict the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and in this caſe I do not ſee how we can vindicate the aſſurance given in ch. i. 3, 'the time is at hand,' and, ch. xxii. 20, 'he that teſtifieth theſe things, ſaith, Surely I come quickly, Amen.' If the Apocalypſe was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, this coming of Chriſt may be underſtood of his coming to judge Jeruſalem, to which the expreſſion, 'till I come,' uſed in St. John's Goſpel, ch. xxi. 22, likewiſe refers. On the other hand, if the Apocalypſe was written in the reign of Domitian,

mitian, the coming of Chriſt admits of no other explanation than his coming to judge the world, or at leaſt to put an end to the reign of the beaſt, and to eſtabliſh his thouſand years kingdom. But in the courſe of ſeventeen hundred years, neither of theſe events has taken place: and to aſſert that the term 'quickly' is conſiſtent with ſo long a duration, becauſe ſeventeen centuries are nothing in compariſon of God's eternity, is a mere ſubterfuge, in which the love of truth is ſacrificed to the ſupport of a pre-aſſumed opinion.

As Lardner has already given a very full and very excellent examination of the queſtion, when the Apocalypſe was written [b], it is the leſs neceſſary for me to be diffuſe on this ſubject: and on two points I may refer the reader entirely to Lardner, namely, the examination of the ſentiments of thoſe ancient writers, who on the authority of Irenæus aſſert, that the Apocalypſe was written in the reign of Domitian, and the inveſtigation of Newton's hypotheſis, which refers it to a much earlier period. Knittel likewiſe in his 'Criticiſms on the Revelation of St. John,' has admirably written on this ſubject, and has introduced much new matter, which is of importance in eſtimating the various opinions, which have been maintained in reſpect to the time when the Apocalypſe was written.

Six different opinions have been advanced. 1. It has been aſſerted, that the Apocalypſe was written in the reign of the Emperor Claudius. 2. Others refer it to the reign of Nero. 3. Others leave it undetermined whether it was written under Claudius or Nero, but contend, that it was written before the reign of Domitian, and before the Jewiſh war. 4. According to the uſual opinion, it was written in the reign of Domitian. 5. It has been referred to the reign of Trajan. 6. To that of Hadrian.

1. The opinion, that the Apocalypſe was written in the reign of Claudius, has no other teſtimony in its favour than

[b] Vol. ix. § 5.

than that of Epiphanius [c], who in his fifty firſt hereſy uſes the expreſſion 'after his (St. John's) return from Patmos under the Emperor Claudius,' and preſently after ſays, 'when St. John propheſied in the days of the Emperor Claudius, while he was in the iſland of Patmos.'

To this ſingle teſtimony of a writer, who lived three hundred years later than St. John, two very material objections have been made. In the firſt place, no traces are to be diſcovered of any perſecution of the Chriſtians in the reign of Claudius: for though he commanded the Jews to quit Rome, yet this command did not affect the Jews who lived out of Italy, and ſtill leſs the Chriſtians. Conſequently the baniſhment of St. John to the iſland of Patmos, can hardly be referred to the reign of Claudius. Secondly, that the ſeven flouriſhing Chriſtian communities at Epheſus, Smyrna, &c. to which the Apocalypſe is addreſſed, exiſted ſo early as the reign of Claudius, is an opinion not eaſy to be reconciled with the hiſtory which is given in the Acts of the Apoſtles, of the firſt planting of Chriſtianity in Aſia Minor. Beſides, it is hardly credible, that St. John reſided at Epheſus, (from which place it is pre-ſuppoſed that he was ſent into baniſhment) ſo early as the time of Claudius: for the account given, Acts xix, of St. Paul's ſtay and conduct at Epheſus, manifeſtly implies that no Apoſtle had already founded and governed a Chriſtian church there. And when St. Paul left the place, the Epheſians had no biſhop: for in an Epiſtle to Timothy written for that purpoſe, he gave orders to regulate the church at Epheſus, and to ordain biſhops. This argument may perhaps be ſtrengthened by obſerving that the ſecond apocalyptical Epiſtle ch. ii. 1, is addreſſed to the angel of the church of Epheſus, that is, as is commonly underſtood, to the biſhop of that church. It has been doubted however, whether the expreſſion αγγελος της εκκλησιας, uſed in the Apocalypſe, really denotes the biſhop of the church: and I remember to have read in an

[c] See Lardner, Vol. I. p. 356.

an Engliſh periodical publication, a ſhort eſſay by an anonymous author, in which this expreſſion is rendered by 'Meſſenger of the church,' the author being of opinion, that the ſeven churches, to which the ſeven Epiſtles in the Apocalypſe are addreſſed, had ſent meſſengers to St. John while he was in baniſhment in the iſland of Patmos. But as each of theſe Epiſtles is addreſſed τῳ ἀγγελῳ της ἐκκλησιας, the word ἀγγελος cannot denote a meſſenger ſent to St. John, for with ſuch a perſon the Apoſtle had a verbal communication, and was therefore under no neceſſity of writing to him.

2. The ſecond opinion, that St. John was baniſhed to Patmos, and wrote the Apocalypſe there, in the reign of the Emperor Nero, is not liable to the objections, which are made to the preceding opinion. It has however only one evidence in its favour: and this evidence, as Lardner obſerves [d], is not only without name, but without date. I mean the ſubſcription to the Syriac verſion of the Apocalypſe, which is, 'The Revelation, which was made by God to John the Evangeliſt in the iſland of Patmos, whither he was baniſhed by the Emperor Nero.'

But ſince the Syriac verſion of the Apocalypſe is now known to be a part of the Philoxenian verſion, which was made by Polycarp at the beginning of the ſixth century, and afterwards corrected by Thomas of Harkel [e], the ſubſcription to it cannot be ſaid to be wholly anonymous, and it may be regarded as the evidence of a writer, who lived in the beginning of the ſixth century. If the ſame ſubſcription was annexed to the more ancient verſion of the Apocalypſe, uſed by Ephrem and the Manichees, it might be called indeed anonymous, but then its importance would be increaſed on another account, by its being ſo much more ancient.

The opinion that the Apocalypſe was written in the reign of Nero has been ſtrongly ſupported by Newton, and Harenberg, whoſe arguments have been ably examined

[d] Supplement, Vol. I. p. 374.

[e] See this Introduction, Vol. II. ch. vii. ſect. xi.

mined by Lardner, to whom I refer every one who wiſhes to know what may be ſaid for and againſt the queſtion. And as the inquiry is of ſuch a nature, that an abſolute deciſion is not to be expected, I ſhall only obſerve that ſeveral arguments in favour of this opinion, eſpecially thoſe uſed by Harenberg, prove nothing more, than that the Apocalypſe, if it is a divine work, cannot have been written later than the reign of Nero. Conſequently, unleſs the divinity of the Apocalypſe be taken for granted, ſuch reaſoning is without force.

3. According to the third opinion, the Apocalypſe was written before the time of Domitian, and before the Jewiſh war, but whether in the reign of Claudius or in the reign of Nero, is left undetermined. Now, when the words of an evidence are ſo indeciſive as to be capable of a two-fold interpretation, it is conſiſtent with equity to admit that which is the moſt probable: and, ſince for the reaſons above-mentioned, it is hardly poſſible that the Apocalypſe ſhould have been written in the reign of Claudius, I will ſuppoſe that according to this opinion likewiſe, the Apocalypſe was written in the reign of Nero.

Arethas, who according to ſome critics lived in the ſixth, according to others in the tenth century, wrote a commentary on the Apocalypſe, in which he expreſsly refers it to a period, prior to the commencement of the Jewiſh war. Lardner indeed obſerves, and not without reaſon, that Arethas is not a writer of ſufficient antiquity to be here regarded as a witneſs: but as what Arethas ſays ſeems to imply really ancient teſtimony, I will examine his account more minutely [f].

In his explanation of the ſixth ſeal ch. vi, 12—17, Arethas ſays, that *ſome* underſtood it figurately, and explained it of the conqueſt of Jeruſalem by Titus, though

[f] The edition of Arethas's Commentary, which I here quote, is that which is printed at the end of the ſecond volume of the Paris edition of Œcumenius.

though moſt perſons referred it to Antichriſt [g]. Now whoever explains ch. vi. 12—17, as a prophecy of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, muſt pre-ſuppoſe that the Apocalypſe was written before that event, for otherwiſe ſuch an explanation would be an inconſiſtency. But I will not puſh this inference too far, becauſe Lardner obſerves [h], that Arethas might have believed the viſions in the ſixth chapter were repreſentations not of future, but of paſt events. However there is another paſſage in the commentary of Arethas, which puts the matter out of doubt, and clearly ſhews that in his opinion the Apocalypſe was written before the Jewiſh war. For after he has explained what is ſaid of the four angels, which ſtood on the four corners of the earth, ch. vii, 1—3, as relating to what happened to the Jews as a puniſhment for their conduct toward Chriſt, and has interpreted the hundred and forty four thouſand, who were ſealed ch. vii, 4—8, of the Jews, who believed in Chriſt, and had no part in the unhappy fate of Jeruſalem [i], he adds, 'For deſtruction by the arms of the Romans was not yet come upon the Jews, when he received theſe prophecies.' Here it muſt be remarked that Arethas was not an original commentator, but that he exhibited in his own work a ſynopſis of the commentaries of Andrew of Cæſarea, who lived about the year 500, and of others who had written on the Apocalypſe. But the explanation of the ſixth chapter, as referring to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem was not taken from Andrew: for though Andrew quotes it in his commentary as an explanation, which had been given, yet he himſelf rejects it [k]. We muſt

[g] Pag. 709. ch. xviii. Τινες δε τουτα εις την υπο Ουεσπασιανω γενομενην πολιορκιαν εξελαβον, παντα τα ειρημενα προπολογησαντες. Οι δε πλειστοι των ερμηνευτων σεισμον την μεταβασιν ειρηκασι την απο των εν τοις δια Χριστον διωγμοις γενομενην εις τον κατα τω Αντιχριστω καιρον.

[h] Supplement, Vol. I. p. 372.

[i] Ib. p. 713.

[k] Ch. xviii, xix. p. 27. 29. Ed. Syllburg.

muſt conclude therefore, that Arethas borrowed this explanation, and conſequently the previous ſuppoſition, that the Apocalypſe was written before the Jewiſh war, from ſome more ancient writer. But we know of no other commentator on the Apocalypſe before Andrew of Cæſarea, than Hippolytus, who lived at the end of the ſecond century. It is therefore not improbable that Arethas borrowed it from Hippolytus: and if he did, it is ſupported by the authority of a very ancient writer.

Perhaps alſo Irenæus may be quoted in favour of the ſame opinion, at leaſt, if the conſtruction which Knittel has put upon his words be the true one. This however is a queſtion which will be examined in the next article. At preſent I will only obſerve, that if Iræneus, the ſcholar of Polycarp really referred the Apocalypſe to a period prior to the reign of Domitian, and if he thus ceaſes to be the grand ſupport of the oppoſite opinion, that it was written during the reign of Domitian, an opinion adopted by his ſucceſſors on his authority, we may with ſafety aſſume, that the Apocalypſe was written before the time of Domitian, before the Jewiſh war, and probably in the reign of Nero.

4. The common opinion that St. John was baniſhed to Patmos, and ſaw the viſions related in the Apocalypſe, during the reign of Domition, is grounded on a paſſage in the works of Irenæus[l], the Greek text of which is thus quoted by Euſebius[m], Γραφων γετοι ὁ Ειρηναιος περι της ψηφε της κατα τον Αντιχριστον προσηγοριας φερομενης εν τ Ιωαννε λεγομενη Αποκαλυψει, αυταις συλλαβαις εν πεμπτω των προς τας αιρεσεις ταυτα περι τε Ιωαννε φησιν. "Ει δε εδει αναφανδον εν τω νυν καιρω κηρυττεσθαι τουνομα τετο, δι' εκεινε αν ερρεθη, τε και της Αποκαλυψιν εωρακοτος. Ουδε γαρ προ πολλε χρονε εωραθη, αλλα σχεδον επι της ἡμετερας γενεας, προς το τελος της Δομετιανε αρχης." This quotation from Irenæus has been generally interpreted thus: 'If it had been proper, that this name ſhould be proclaimed in the preſent

[l] Adv. Hæres. Lib. V. cap. 30. § 3.

[m] Hiſt. Eccles. Lib. III. cap. 18.

preſent time, it would have been made known by him who ſaw the Revelation. For it was ſeen only a ſhort time ago, almoſt in our own age, towards the cloſe of the reign of Domitian.' And almoſt all the eccleſiaſtical writers, who have ſpoken of the time when the Apocalypſe was written, have followed this account.

But ſeveral modern commentators, who wiſh to refer the Apocalypſe to the reign of Nero, that they may be better able to explain its prophecies, contend that the words of Irenæus have been miſunderſtood by eccleſiaſtical writers, and that Irenæus did not mean to ſay, that the Revelation was ſeen in the reign of Domitian. Wetſtein for inſtance, aſſerts that the verb εωραθη refers, not to Αποκαλυψις but to Ιωαννης, and that the words of Irenæus ſignify only that St. John was ſeen at the end of Domitian's reign[n]. And Harenberg[o], though he admits that εωραθη ſhould be conſtrued with Αποκαλυψις, yet he aſſigns to the expreſſion εωραθη Αποκαλυψις a meaning totally different from that which is uſually aſſigned to it, and explains it as denoting, not that the viſions were ſeen by St. John ſo late as the reign of Domitian, but that the Apocalypſe, namely the book ſo called, was firſt ſeen by the Chriſtians of Gaul (where Irenæus reſided) in the reign of Domitian[p]. Both of theſe interpretations appear to me very improbable.

However

[n] Ubi nihil cogit, εωραθη interpretari de apocalipſi viſa, aut cum interprete Latino Irenæi de nomine viſo, cum commodiſſime et veriſſime de ipſo Joanne dici poſſit, eum ſub exitum imperii Domitiani conſpectum fuiſſe. Wetſtein, N. T. Tom. II. p. 746.

[o] Pag. 6, 7. 64. of his Expoſition of the Apocalypſe.

[p] He likewiſe takes the name Domitian in a figurative ſenſe, and ſuppoſes that it denotes, not the emperor, who properly bore that name, but either Marcus Aurelius or Septimus Severus, to each of whom, on account of their perſecution of the Chriſtians, he ſays the name of Domitian was applicable. Now the only reaſon, which can be aſſigned for this very forced interpretation is, that Irenæus uſes the expreſſion σχεδον επι της ημετερας γενεας, which Harenberg tranſlates 'within the laſt thirty years,' aſcribing to γενεα the ſenſe, which genealogiſts aſcribe to the very word 'generation,' and at the ſame time wholly overlooking σχεδον. Now though I grant that in genealogical computations

However there is a third interpretation given by Knittel, which is leſs liable to objection, and which though it is the moſt new, may in ſome meaſure be ſaid to be the moſt ancient. According to this interpretation, εωραθη is referred to το ονομα, that is, to the name of the beaſt, whoſe number is 666: for on this number Irenæus is diſcourſing in the paſſage in queſtion, and explains it as denoting Titan, which, when written in Greek TEITAN, contains ſix letters, which makes out the number 666. This name Knittle conſiders as an illuſion to the prænomen of Domitian, which was Titus, and ſays, that the name of Titan was juſtly applicable to Domitian, becauſe toward the cloſe of his reign he inſiſted on divine honours being paid him, and was therefore a θεομαχος, as the Titans were. It is true that ονομα is not ſo ſuitable to εωραθη, as it would be to ηκασθη: but even this difficulty will be removed, if we only ſupply the word 'Titan.' According to this explanation then, the meaning of Irenæus will be, 'Titan ſhewed himſelf not long before our time, toward the cloſe of the reign of Domitian;' for this emperor exhibited his bad qualities, chiefly in the latter part of his reign, when he conducted himſelf in ſuch a manner as might be expected from the Antichriſt, or the threatened Titan. Irenæus indeed did not believe that Domitian was the real Antichriſt predicted in the Apocalypſe, whoſe coming he ſtill expected: yet he might regard Domitian

computations the word γενεα may be taken in this reſtricted ſenſe, yet when an author ſays in indefinite terms σχεδον επι της ημετερας γενεας, he can mean only 'not long before our time,' that is, not long before I, or at leaſt many perſons now living were born.' And ſince Irenæus himſelf was born in the year 130, he might without impropriety apply the expreſſion to an event which happened at the end of Domitian's reign, eſpecially as he ſpeaks in the plural number, and there were undoubtedly many perſons alive when he wrote, who were born ſtill earlier than himſelf. I might ſurely ſay, in the preſent year 1786, that Pruſſia was erected into a monarchy almoſt in our own time: for, though this event took place ſeventeen years before I was born, yet the uſe of the particle 'almoſt,' and of the plural number, many perſons being now alive, who were born before that event, renders the expreſſion perfectly admiſſible.

Domitian as a forerunner and type of the true Antichriſt. Such is Knittel's opinion: and this at leaſt muſt be admitted, that his conſtruction of εωραθη with ονομα is ſupported by the authority of the old Latin tranſlator of Irenæus's works, who has rendered the paſſage in queſtion in the following manner; Si oporteret manifeſte præſenti tempore præconari nomen ejus, per ipſum utique edictum fuiſſet, qui et Apocalypſin viderat. Neque enim ante multum temporis *viſum eſt*, ſed pene ſub noſtro ſeculo, ad finem Domitiani imperii. Further, Knittel appeals to the context of the Latin tranſlation, and ſupports his opinion by very plauſible arguments. If he is in the right, the Apocalypſe was not only written before the reign of Domitian, but contains prophecies, which relate to him.

5. In a Latin work, containing the lives of the Apoſtles, aſcribed to Dorotheus, who lived at the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century, and who is ſaid to have been biſhop of Tyre, the baniſhment of St. John to the iſland of Patmos is placed in the reign of Trajan: but at the ſame time it is obſerved, that in the opinion of others he was baniſhed in the reign of Domitian[q]. Of theſe Latin lives there exiſts a Greek tranſlation, made by a perſon unknown: and this Greek tranſlation, as publiſhed by Cave, mentions likewiſe Trajan.

6. On the other hand, according to another copy, which Knittel found in a Wolfenbüttel manuſcript of the Apocalypſe, 'St. John was baniſhed to Patmos by the Emperor Hadrian[r].' Theſe two laſt dates are ſupported by only one evidence, and it is moreover uncertain whether he meant Trajan or Hadrian. For this reaſon I barely mention theſe dates, without inquiring into their probality.

Among theſe different opinions relative to the time when the Apocalypſe was written, our choice muſt in a great meaſure depend on the opinion which we entertain of

[q] Bibliotheca Patrum maxima, Tom. VII. 122.

[r] See Knittel, p. 88, 89.

of the work itſelf, whether we conſider it as an inſpired book, or regard it only as a human compoſition.

If we conſider the Apocalypſe as a divine work, I think we muſt confine our choice to thoſe dates which precede the commencement of the Jewiſh war: for thus only ſhall we be enabled to ſhew that its firſt prophecies were fulfilled in a ſhort time. And I grant that if it is referred to the reign of Claudius, the explanation of it is ſtill eaſier, than when it is referred to the reign of Nero: for the ſcarcity predicted, chap. vi. 6, is deſcriptive of that which took place in the time of Claudius.

If it be conſidered as a mere human invention, it may be either aſcribed to Cerinthus, or attributed to ſome unknown writer, who lived between the time of Papias and that of Juſtin Martyr[s]: in the latter caſe it might have been written in the reign of Hadrian. But if it be really a forgery, if it contains prophecies of the Jewiſh war made after the events themſelves had taken place, we have reaſon to wonder that the author did not propheſy more circumſtantially, and that he appears ſo little acquainted with the events of that war[t].

SECT. X.

Of the Greek ſtyle of the Apocalypſe.

IN examining the queſtion, whether St. John the Apoſtle was the author of the Apocalypſe, its Greek ſtyle, which differs from that of every other book in the New Teſtament, deſerves particular attention. But the application of the remarks to be made on this ſubject will depend on the queſtion examined in the preceding ſection,

[s] See what was ſaid of Papias and Juſtin Martyr in the ſecond ſection of this chapter.

[t] See the latter part of the ſeventh ſection.

ſection, namely, at what time the Apocalypſe was written: for it cannot be denied, that the ſame author may at one period of his life make uſe of a ſtyle, which is very different from that which he has uſed at another.

That the ſtyle of the Apocalypſe is very unlike that of any other book of the New Teſtament, is a fact, which no man, who underſtands Greek, and is capable of judging impartially, will deny. Nor is this difference of ſuch a kind only, that we might aſcribe it to the peculiarity of the ſubject, and ſay, that the ſame author, when he wrote in the character of a prophet, would uſe different modes of expreſſion from thoſe which he had adopted as an hiſtorian: whence might be explained the contraſt between the ſimple unadorned ſtyle of St. John's Goſpel, and the rich figurative language of the Apocalypſe. But when the rules of the Greek grammar are accurately obſerved in St. John's Goſpel, and are frequently violated in the Apocalypſe, we have a difference, which cannot be aſcribed to the diſſimilitude of the ſubject: for the ſame author, who wrote correctly as an hiſtorian, would not be guilty of ſoleciſms even in writing prophecies.

Dionyſius of Alexandria, whoſe modeſty and gentleneſs of temper I commended in the ſecond ſection of this chapter, was well aware of the difference between the ſtyle of the Apocalypſe, and that of St. John's genuine writings: and for this very reaſon, though he did not venture to deny that the Apocalypſe was a ſacred book, yet he aſſerted that St. John the Apoſtle was not the author of it. The difference in queſtion may be reduced to the following heads:

1. The Apocalypſe abounds with harſh conſtructions, in which a nominative is placed, where another caſe ought to have been uſed. Of this ſort the following inſtances have been alleged by Bengel[a]: ch. i. 5. απο Ιησυ Χριστε, ὁ μαρτυς ὁ πιστος: ii. 20. την γυναικα ἡ λεγουσα: iii. 12. της καινης Ἱερουσαλημ, ἡ καταβαινουσα: viii. 9. το τριτον των κτισματων τα εχοντα ψυχας: ix. 14. τῳ αγγελῳ ὁ εχων

[a] Apparatus Criticus: Fundam. criſ. Apoc. § 5.

εχων την σαλπιγγα: xiv. 12. των αγιων οι τηρουντες: xviii. 11, 12. τον γομον αυτων ουδεις αγοραζει ουκετι, γομος χρυσου: xx. 2. τον δρακοντα, ὁ οφις ὁ αρχαιος: xxi. 10. 12. την πολιν—εχουσα. He further adds: nec longe abeunt illa, xiv. 5. τῳ θηριῳ, και την εικονα αυτου: xvii. 4. βδελυγματων, και τα ακαθαρτα: vel etiam, iv. 4. vii. 9, xiii. 3.

To theſe examples ſelected by Bengel may be added the following: In ch. i, 6, the reading of moſt manuſcripts is εποιησεν ἡμας βασιλειαν ἱερεις, which is taken from the Hebrew text of Exod. xix. 6, 'a kingdom of prieſts,' though the ſeventy have rendered it in a different manner, namely, βασιλειον ἱερατευμα: but the author of the Apocalypſe follows not the Greek, but the Hebrew, and lets ἱερεις remain with its termination unaltered to denote a genitive. In ch. ii. 13, according to the common printed text, mention is made of a martyr Antipas, a perſon unknown in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory: but four manuſcripts, inſtead of a proper name Αντιπας, have the verb αντειπας, and with the following ſtrange conſtruction, εν αις αντειπας ὁ μαρτυς μου ὁ πιστος, 'in which thou haſt ſpoken againſt my faithful witneſs.' The reading αντειπας is ſupported alſo by the authority of the Syriac verſion, and of the Arabic verſion publiſhed by Erpenius, which in other places of the Apocalypſe does not uſually follow the Syriac. Both of theſe verſions expreſs in quibus contendiſti cum teſte, &c.

Conſtructions of this kind were probably not unuſual among the Greek Jews: at leaſt I have found ſeveral examples in thoſe books of the Septuagint which are not ſo well tranſlated as the Pentateuch*; for inſtance, 2 Sam. xv. 31. και απηγγελη Δαυιδ λεγοντες, and Iſaiah xxiv. 16. και τοις αθετουσιν οι αθετουντες τον νομον. But we find no ſuch examples in the Goſpel and Epiſtles of St. John: and this extraordinary uſe of the nominative for another caſe will hardly be confounded with the nominative abſolute of Attic writers.

But

* Even in the Pentateuch, according to the text of the Codex Alexandrinus we meet with ſome examples of this kind: Gen. xiv. 13. ὁι την δρυν την Μαμβρη ὁ Αμορεις. xl. 5. ὁρασις τω ενυπνιω αυτου, ὁ αρχιοινοχοος, και ὁ αρχισιτοποιος.

But before I proceed, I muſt acknowledge, that the examples of harſh conſtruction above-quoted from the Apocalypſe, if we except that which was taken from ch. i. 5, though they are found in good manuſcripts are not contained in all, and that they have been adopted in very few printed editions, in moſt of which the nominative is converted into a caſe more ſuitable to the context. Here then it may be objected, that when we have the choice of two readings, one of which is grammatically correct, while the other contains falſe grammar, we ought to aſcribe the latter, not to the incorrectneſs of the author, but to the inaccuracy of a tranſcriber. Now if a grammatical error was found in a manuſcript of Cicero's works, no doubt could be entertained that the ungrammatical reading did not proceed from the pen of the author: but that the ungrammatical conſtructions in the manuſcripts of the Apocalypſe cannot be aſcribed wholly to the copyiſts [x], will appear from the following arguments.

Firſt, though an illiterate tranſcriber may ſometimes copy falſely, and convert an accurate expreſſion into a ſoleciſm, yet it is incredible that ſeveral tranſcribers ſhould agree not only in copying falſely in the very ſame places, but likewiſe in ſubſtituting the ſame miſtaken readings, and in converting the true caſe into a nominative without any aſſignable reaſon.

Secondly, theſe unuſual conſtructions occur too frequently in the Apocalypſe to be imputed wholly to tranſcribers: for, if they aroſe merely from the inaccuracy of tranſcribers, we ſhould as frequently meet with ſuch examples in the other books of the New Teſtament, as in the Apocalypſe, many of the tranſcribers of which have not copied this book alone. Since then theſe ungrammatical conſtructions occur ſo frequently in the Apocalypſe, but not in other books of the New Teſtament written by the ſame tranſcribers, the only inference to be drawn is that they proceeded from the author himſelf.

Thirdly,

[x] Bengel ſays of the examples above-quoted, Singulatim hæc exſibilare facile eſt: univerſa nemo convellet.

Thirdly, it is certain that theſe ungrammatical conſtructions exiſted in the Apocalypſe long before our moſt ancient manuſcripts were written: and therefore they cannot be aſcribed to the ignorance of copyiſts in the middle ages. For even in the third century, when ancient Greek was ſtill a living language, and when therefore it cannot be ſuppoſed that Greek tranſcribers would in copying make grammatical miſtakes, Dionyſius of Alexandria delivered his opinion of the language of the Apocalypſe in the following words [y]: 'I find the language uſed by the author not good Greek; for it is disfigured by barbariſms and ſometimes by ſoleciſms, which I do not think it neceſſary to quote, as it is my intention not to ridicule, but only to ſhew that the ſtyle of theſe writings [z] is not the ſame [a].

2. The Apocalypſe abounds with Hebraiſms much more than the writings of St. John.

It is true that ſome critics have gone too far with this aſſertion, and have repreſented St. John's Goſpel as perfectly pure Greek [b], while the Apocalypſe has been charged with Hebraiſms in places where there really are none. But that the Hebraiſms in the Apocalypſe are more numerous and more harſh, than thoſe in the Goſpel and the Epiſtles of St. John, is a fact which muſt be ſo viſible to every one who has only a moderate knowledge of Hebrew, that I think it unneceſſary to quote examples.

3. Though

[y] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. VII. cap. 25.

[z] Namely St. John's Goſpel and the Apocalypſe.

[a] It is not improbable that many of the ſoleciſms of which Dionyſius ſpeaks in the third century were gradually corrected by tranſcribers. See Vol. I. Ch. VI. Sect. XI. of this Introduction. The number of the MSS. of the Apocalypſe hitherto collated is inconſiderable: and it is poſſible that into all of theſe the grammatical corrections have found their way. Attention therefore muſt be paid to whatever ſoleciſms may be found in ſingle manuſcripts of the Apocalypſe, for they may be remnants of the ancient reading: for inſtance that of the Wolfenbüttel manuſcript, Ch. viii. 2. εδοθη αυτοις ιπτα σαλπιγγες.

[b] For inſtance Dionyſius of Alexandria, at the end of the paſſage quoted by Euſebius.

3. Though the figurative language of the Apocalypſe, when compared with the ſimple ſtyle of St. John's Goſpel, cannot be alleged as an argument that the two books were written by different authors, ſince the ſame author, when animated by a ſpirit of prophecy will write in a different manner from that in which he had written as an hiſtorian, yet there is a certain character in the language in the Apocalypſe which is hardly to be reconciled with the manner, which is viſible in St. John's Goſpel. Throughout almoſt the whole of the Apocalypſe we find the author an imitator of the ancient prophets, from whom he borrows his images, and renders them more beautiful than they were in the originals: but St. John's Goſpel has a ſoft and gentle character ſo peculiar to itſelf, as to exhibit no trace of imitation. Further, the author of the Apocalypſe (whom from the title of the book I will call St. John the Divine, in contradiſtinction to St. John the Apoſtle,) has not borrowed his imagery merely from the canonical books of the Old Teſtament, for he has taken a great part of it from the Jewiſh antiquities, and the theology of the Rabbins, ſo that his work has almoſt a cabaliſtic appearance. And he not only ſeems himſelf to be intimately acquainted with theſe ſubjects, but to preſuppoſe the ſame intimacy in his readers; and to have written for thoſe only who were initiated in the abſtruſeſt doctrines which were taught in the ſchools of the Rabbins: nor does it even once occur to him, that what he ſays may appear foreign or obſcure. But St. John the Apoſtle ſeems to have been well aware that not all his readers had this kind of knowledge: for he has frequently explained circumſtances relative to the city of Jeruſalem, and the cuſtoms of the Jews, with more hiſtorical perſpicuity, than we find even in the other Evangeliſts.

4. On the other hand, the language of the Apocalypſe is both beautiful and ſublime, is affecting and animating: and this not only in the original, but in every, even the worſt, tranſlation of it. Who can read, if he reads without prejudice, the following addreſs of Jeſus to

John ſinking to the ground through fear, and not be affected by the greatneſs of the thoughts and the expreſſions. 'Fear not, I am the firſt and the laſt: I am he that was dead, but now liveth: behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death[d].' The Apocalypſe has ſomething in it, which enchants, and inſenſibly inſpires the reader with the ſublime ſpirit of the author. When future bleſſedneſs is promiſed, or the New Jeruſalem deſcribed, a man muſt be devoid of feeling, who is not affected: and when the author denounces judgment to the wicked, and repreſents the ſmoke of their torment aſcending up for ever and ever, before the throne of God and his angels, one muſt be either prejudiced before one reads, or one cannot read without terror. A great part of the imagery is borrowed from the ancient prophets: but the imitation is for the moſt part more beautiful and more magnificent than the original, which is particularly true of what is borrowed from Ezekiel. And the imagery which is taken from the theology of the Rabbins, acquires in the Apocalypſe a taſte and eloquence, of which the Rabbinical writings themſelves are wholly deſtitute.

St. John's Goſpel has likewiſe its beauties, but then they are beauties of a very different kind. For while the Author of the Apocalypſe hurries us away to enchanted ground, and reſembles a torrent which carries every thing before it, St. John the Apoſtle is plainneſs and gentleneſs, and is like a clear rivulet, which flows without rapidity and violence. Is it poſſible therefore that St. John the Apoſtle, and the author of the Apocalypſe, called St. John the Divine, were one and the ſame perſon?

5. Dionyſius of Alexandria remarks, that St. John the Apoſtle has not mentioned his own name either in his Goſpel, or in any of his Epiſtles, but that, when he has occaſion to ſpeak of himſelf he makes uſe of a circumlocution. On the other hand, St. John the Divine mentions his own name, not only in places, where it was requiſite,

[d] Ch. i. 17, 18.

requiſite, as in the addreſs to the ſeven churches, ch. i. 4, but likewiſe in places where the ſingle pronoun 'I,' or the expreſſion 'he who ſaw this,' would have been full as proper as the term 'I John.' The one appears to have an exceſſive modeſty, and to avoid even the ſhadow of egotiſm: the other avoids it ſo little, that he is laviſh in the uſe of his name. And what renders this difference the more remarkable, is, that the circumlocution by which St. John the Apoſtle denotes himſelf, namely, 'the diſciple whom Jeſus loved,' is not once uſed by St. John the Divine.

It is an undeniable fact therefore that the ſtyle of the Apocalypſe is very different from that of St. John's Goſpel. It is true that ſome commentators, in order to ſhew a ſimilarity between the language of the Apocalypſe and that of St. John's Goſpel and Epiſtles, have ſelected expreſſions from the former, which reſemble thoſe that occur in the latter. This has been particularly done by Leonard Twells, whoſe defence of the Apocalypſe is inſerted in Wolfii Curæ[e]. But in Lardner's opinion, to whoſe judgment I fully accede, the examples ſelected by Twells are by no means ſufficient to prove a ſimilarity of ſtyle: and, even if they were ſelected with more judgment, and the reſemblance in thoſe particular inſtances, admitted of no doubt[f], ſtill the diſſimilarity will remain in

[e] Vindiciæ Apocalypſeos, p. 399—404.

[f] I will mention one or two examples, which have occurred to me in reading the Apocalypſe. The word αρνιον which occurs ſo frequently in the Apocalypſe, (a word ſeldom uſed in the LXX) is found no where elſe in the whole N. T. except in the Goſpel of St. John, ch. xxi. 15. The expreſſion ποιειν αληθειαν and ποιειν ψευδος is uſed Apoc. xxii. 15, and in the firſt Epiſtle of St. John, ch. i. 6. Further in Apoc. i. 7, there is a quotation from Zech. xii. 10, not according to the text of the Septuagint, but with a different reading, as in St. John's Goſpel, ch. xix. 37. and it is remarkable that this paſſage from Zechariah, which occurred to St. John, when he ſaw Chriſt pierced on the croſs, is quoted by no other of the ſacred writers. This laſt example has been already noted by Twells, but he has not given it the force of which it is capable. See my Hiſtory of the Reſurrection, p. 31. However theſe inſtances will not prove that the Apocalypſe was written by St. John the Apoſtle: for the author of it may in ſome caſes have imitated St. John's manner, in order to make his work paſs the more eaſily for the compoſition of St. John.

in other places, and will remain ſo great, that they who have thence inferred, that the Apocalypſe was not written by St. John the Apoſtle, have drawn an inference which is not devoid of probability.

To this inference however it may be objected, that a courſe of years might have made a material alteration in St. John's ſtyle, ſince the manner of writing which we have adopted in the early part of life, is frequently changed in a later part of it, eſpecially when the former manner was imperfect, and ſtood in need of improvement. It is poſſible, therefore, that St. John in the earlier part of his life, might have written with the fire which is viſible in the Apocalypſe, and, being at that time leſs converſant with Greek, wrote incorrectly, and retained alſo much of the oriental manner, but that in his old age he wrote with that gentleneſs which is viſible in his Goſpel, and likewiſe, in conſequence of his long reſidence at Epheſus, more correct Greek. All this may be inferred on the ſuppoſition that the Apocalypſe was written in the reign of Claudius or of Nero: but if it was written in the reign of Domitian, its ſtyle is an irreſiſtible argument that St. John the Apoſtle was not the author. For in a work written by St. John in his old age, after he had long reſided among the Greeks, he would hardly have violated thoſe very rules of grammar which he had obſerved in his Goſpel: his ſtyle would hardly have become more oriental; nor would he have diſplayed that fire of compoſition which he had not exhibited in his earlier works.

The queſtion therefore whether the Apocalypſe is a divine book, depends again on the time when it was written, whether ſo early as the reign of Claudius or of Nero, or ſo late as the reign of Domitian. If according to the common opinion, it was written in the reign of Domitian, I do not ſee in what manner its divinity can be ſupported.

SECT. XI.

Whether the Apocalypſe was originally written in Hebrew.

SOME commentators have ſuppoſed that the Apocalypſe was originally written in Hebrew, and that our Greek text is only a tranſlation. Now it cannot be denied, that the mode of writing is quite oriental: but ſince the teſtimony of no ancient writer can be produced in favour of the opinion that it was written originally in Hebrew, and its oriental ſtyle may be eaſily explained on the ſuppoſition, that the author of it was a Hebrew by birth, and though, in his native language, he wrote in Greek, to which he was leſs accuſtomed, the notion of a Hebrew original appears to be without foundation.

But that I may not be unjuſt to an opinion which I do not think proper to adopt, I will obſerve that one might allege in favour of it ſeveral various readings, which have the appearance of being different tranſlations of the ſame Hebrew word. For inſtance, inſtead of the very improbable reading[g] δυο μυριαδες μυριαδων (two hundred millions) ch. ix. 16, ſeveral manuſcripts have, as I think more properly, μυριαδες μυριαδων, which is an indeterminate expreſſion, and nothing more than an hyperbole; denoting a very great number in general. Here if the Hebrew word רבותים had been uſed in the original, it might have been taken by one perſon for the plural and rendered μυριαδες μυριαδων, by another for the dual, and rendered δυο μυριαδες μυριαδων, in the ſame manner as רבותים, Pſ. lxviii. 18, is by ſome explained 'two myriads.'—Inſtead of και λεγει μοι, ch. x. 11, nine MSS. quoted by Wetſtein, to which may be added the Wolfenbüttel MS, have και λεγουσι μοι. This may be

[g] The reaſon why I conſider this reading as very improbable is aſſigned in the Orient. Bib. Vol. VIII. p. 158, 159.

be two different tranſlations of the Hebrew, ואמר לי, one tranſlator rendering literally, the other taking אמר impersonally in the ſenſe of 'one ſays,' or 'they ſay,' in which manner the word is frequently uſed by modern rabbins.—Inſtead of κατοικουντας, ch. xiv. 6, the Complutenſion edition, ſixteen MSS. quoted by Wetſtein, the Wolfenbüttel MS. Origen, Andrew, Arethas, and the Vulgate, have καθημενους. Theſe two readings may be different tranſlations of the Hebrew יושבים.

However ſuch examples are by no means ſufficient to prove a poſition, which is wholly unſupported by hiſtorical evidence. For theſe variations may be eaſily explained on other ſuppoſitions: the laſt variation, for inſtance καθημενους, which is a harſh Hebraiſm, is probably the genuine reading, and κατοικουντας, added in the margin as an explanation of it, was afterwards in ſome manuſcripts inſerted in the text.

SECT. XII.

Remarks on the doctrine delivered in the Apocalypſe.

LUTHER in his preface to the Apocalypſe prefixed to the edition, which was printed in 1522, objects, that Chriſt was not taught in the Apocalypſe, which an Apoſtle is above all things bound to do, ſince Chriſt himſelf ſays, Acts i, 'Ye ſhall be my witneſſes.' Now this objection, delivered in ſuch general terms, is, I think, without foundation: and I cannot conceive how Luther could ſay, that Chriſt is not taught in a book, in which ſo frequent mention is made, and that too in very affecting terms, of our redemption by Chriſt's blood and death. But the true and eternal Godhead of Chriſt is certainly not taught in the Apocalypſe ſo clearly as in St. John's Goſpel, though the author

ſpeaks in enthuſiaſtic language of the greatneſs of Chriſt's miniſtry, and the glory communicated to his human nature. At the very beginning of the book Chriſt is placed after the ſeven ſpirits, who ſtand near the throne of God: nor is he ever called God, or the creator of the world, throughout the whole work. Even the form under which Chriſt appears, ch. i. 13—15, is, with only a few alterations, borrowed from Dan. x. 5, 6, where is given the deſcription of an angel. It is true, that Chriſt is called ὁ Λογος τȣ Θεȣ, ch. xix. 13, ; but this appellation is not deciſive, for it appears from the antitheſes, which St. John in the beginning of his Goſpel makes againſt Cerinthus, that even falſe teachers could give to Chriſt the title of 'Word of God,' without acknowledging, that he was God himſelf. And on account of this very appellation uſed ch. xix. 13, the ſuſpicion aroſe, that Cerinthus was the author of the Apocalypſe, becauſe it is uſed by no other of the ſacred writers than St. John, but was the common appellation of Chriſt's divine nature among the Gnoſtics. St. John in his Goſpel was under the neceſſity of retaining this expreſſion, becauſe he makes antitheſes againſt the Gnoſtics: but in the Apocalypſe no ſuch motive could have taken place, and if this book was written in the time of Nero, before the breaking out of the Cerinthian hereſy, and long before St. John's Goſpel was written, it is difficult to comprehend how St. John, at ſo early a period, came to apply the appellation of 'Word of God' to Chriſt's divine nature. Further, it is true, that Chriſt is called in the Apocalypſe, ch. i. 17, 'the firſt and the laſt:' and this expreſſion, if taken in the ſame ſenſe, as that in which it is uſed, Iſaiah xli. 4. xliv. 6. xlviii. 12, may denote Chriſt's eternal Godhead. Yet it is not abſolutely deciſive: for the meaning of ch. i. 17, may be, 'Fear not, I am the firſt (whom thou kneweſt as mortal), and the laſt (whom thou now ſeeſt immortal), ſtill the ſame, whom thou kneweſt from the beginning.' The ſame explanation may be given of ch. ii. 8, where

the

the expreſſion 'the firſt and the laſt' again occurs and is uſed in connexion with Chriſt's reſurrection from the dead. On the other hand, in ch. ix. 11, where the words are leſs dubious, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, is a ſpurious addition.

In the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypſe is delivered an extraordinary doctrine relative to an heavenly mother, who bare in heaven a child who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron. This is a doctrine which is taught in no other part of the Bible: but it reſembles what was taught by ſeveral heretics, concerning the mother of life, who bare the firſt heavenly man, that is, the heavenly Jeſus. And as, according to their doctrine, the prince of darkneſs devours a part of the armour of the firſt man, ſo in the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypſe, the dragon endeavours to devour the new born child, who is caught up to God and his throne, as the firſt man was according to the heretics. The 15th verſe reſembles likewiſe what the heretics ſay of the drowned Jeſus, with only this difference, that what they ſaid of Jeſus is here ſaid of the mother. The whole of this chapter may be explained indeed in ſuch a manner, as to remove all offence: yet it is difficult to read it, without thinking of certain cabaliſtic, Gnoſtic, and what in later ages were Manichean doctrines, eſpecially if one has examined what Beauſobre has written in his Hiſtoire des Manichéens, Liv. VI. ch. 3. Liv. VIII. ch. 4.

The ſeven ſpirits of God, from whom a ſalutation is ſent, ch. i. 4, and who are placed before Chriſt himſelf, create likewiſe a difficulty, which commentators endeavour to remove by ſaying, that nothing more is meant than the ſingle perſon of the Holy Ghoſt: but as the Jews really ſpeak of ſeven archangels, who had acceſs to the throne of God, the ſeven ſpirits before the throne of God, mentioned ch. i. 4, can hardly be interpreted of the Holy Ghoſt. One may imagine, that inſpiration is aſcribed to theſe ſeven ſpirits, and that hence they are called in the Apocalypſe, not angels, but ſpirits. The image of the ſeven lamps, under which

they

they are repreſented, ch. iv. 5, is very ſuitable to this notion: and the expreſſion 'he hath the ſeven ſpirits of God,' ch. iii. 1, may denote the higheſt degree of inſpiration. But the moſt important paſſage is, ch. xxii. 6, according to the reading, Κυριος ὁ Θεος των πνευματων των προφητων απεστειλε τον αγγελον αυτου, where ſeveral ſpirits are mentioned, who inſpired the prophets, and one of them appears to be the ſpirit who ſhewed to the author of the Apocalypſe the principal viſions.

In no book of the New Teſtament is ſo frequent mention made of angels as in the Apocalypſe, in which they appear to be appropriated to particular countries and elements. This however may be conſidered as mere imagery, and explained according to the principles laid down in the ſixth ſection of this chapter. The worſhipping of angels is clearly forbidden in the Apocalypſe: but in ch. viii. 2, 3, a high ſacerdotal office is aſſigned to an angel, which we are accuſtomed to aſſign only to our Redeemer.

The doctrine of the Millennium is that which created the greateſt number of adverſaries to the Apocalypſe in the early ages of Chriſtianity, and excited the ſuſpicion that it was a forgery of Cerinthus. They were particularly diſpleaſed with the repreſentation, that after the reſurrection of the dead a worldly kingdom ſhould be eſtabliſhed on earth for a thouſand years. Even to us this doctrine appears ſtrange and incredible: but to the ancient fathers, who, agreeably to the commonly received philoſophy in thoſe days, derived all ſin from the groſs particles of matter of which the body is compoſed, it neceſſarily gave more offence. And if in this kingdom marriages were to be celebrated, and feſtivals held, which however is not expreſsly aſſerted in the Apocalypſe, all thoſe fathers, who declaimed againſt bodily pleaſures, and regarded the ſtate of celibacy as a ſtate of holineſs, of courſe diſapproved of the life to be led in this kingdom, as being, according to their notions, much too ſenſual, even if the marriages and feſtivals were confined wholly to thoſe, who

ſhould

ſhould be alive at the general reſurrection. The doctrine of the Millennium was rejected by the reformers in the ſixteenth century on a very different account, and was condemned, not merely as a ſpeculative, but as a dangerous practical error. For the expectation of a kingdom in which pure ſaints ſhould rule over the unregenerate children of the world began to excite a ſpirit of ſedition, as it is very eaſy for the unruly members of a diſcontented party to fancy, that they themſelves are the ſaints, and their opponents the unregenerate: and for this very reaſon the Augſburg Confeſſion[b] condemns the doctrine of the Millennium in expreſs terms. Further, according to the repreſentation of the ancient Chiliaſts, offerings and offering-feſtivals were to be celebrated in this kingdom: but ſuch notions are inconſiſtent with St. Paul's doctrine concerning the imperfection and abolition of the Levitical law.

On the other hand it muſt be granted, that the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypſe, in which is deſcribed the kingdom of a thouſand years, does not contain all that the ancient Chiliaſts aſſigned to their Millennium. It contains nothing of offerings and of a Jewiſh temple, and this addition was made by the Chiliaſts from the nine laſt chapters of Ezekiel, which they interpreted literally. Nor is mention made of marriages in the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypſe; but in the deſcription which Ezekiel makes of his temple, are given laws for the marriage of prieſts, to which the Chiliaſts probably appealed in ſupport of their opinion. That the ſaints ſhould rule over the unregenerate, is a doctrine, which ſtands more plainly in the Apocalypſe: but by the ſaints we may underſtand either the church of God, or the Jewiſh nation returned to their own country. The firſt reſurrection, which is to precede the kingdom of a thouſand years, is clearly taught in this chapter, if we take the words as they are, and do not have recourſe to figurative explanations: and though they who riſe from the dead, are,

[b] Art. XVII. de reditu Chriſtu ad judicium.

are, according to this chapter, not to be the only inhabitants of the kingdom, it appears, that they are to take part in it as princes and magiſtrates, and to return from a better life, which their ſoul enjoyed, to this earthly one, which is a humiliation. In order to remove this difficulty, thoſe commentators, who are not Chiliaſts, explain the firſt reſurrection as a mere figure.

The twentieth chapter of the Apocalypſe, which occaſioned the greateſt part of the objections made by the Antichiliaſts, ſeems to have been formed from the thirty-ſeventh, thirty-eighth, and thirty-ninth chapters of Ezekiel; only what Ezekiel had ſaid is ſhortened, and the pictureſque beauties, as in other parts of the Apocalypſe, greatly improved. Ezekiel propheſies an invaſion of Magog, which was certainly not fulfilled when the Apocalypſe was written, and, if we take his words literally, ſeems to threaten the Jews, who lived in the promiſed land, with a long interruption of their proſperity. Immediately before, in the thirty-ſeventh chapter, Ezekiel had ſeen a reſurrection of the dead, which however is to be interpreted, not literally of the coming of dead bodies to life, but according to Ezekiel's own explanation, of the reſurrection of the Jewiſh ſtate after the captivity, though many of the Jewiſh commentators themſelves have taken Ezekiel in a ſtrict ſenſe. In like manner the author of the Apocalypſe propheſies a firſt reſurrection which is to take place before the proſperity of the church is interrupted by Magog. Whether that firſt reſurrection is to be underſtood literally or figuratively is a queſtion, into which I cannot enter at preſent. Whoever regards the Apocalypſe as a mere human compoſition, may ſay, that the author of it miſunderſtood Ezekiel, and interpreted him more literally than the prophet himſelf intended. On the other hand, they who receive the Apocalypſe as a divine work, will find in a compariſon of the Apocalypſe with Ezekiel the beſt means of freeing the doctrine of a firſt reſurrection of its improbability: for they need only ſay, that the author of the former

treats

treats the ſame ſubject, which Ezekiel had propheſied more clearly, and that he took for granted his readers would underſtand him in ſuch a manner as Ezekiel intended to be underſtood.

The deſcription given in the Apocalypſe of the kingdom of the beaſt is taken from Daniel, but is augmented by the addition of various circumſtances. It muſt be remarked however, that in the Apocalypſe the beaſt is never called Antichriſt, a name, which occurs no where, but in the Epiſtles of St. John, and is there uſed in a ſenſe which has no relation to the apocalyptical beaſt or harlot. If the term Antichriſt therefore be taken in its biblical ſenſe, the doctrine relative to Antichriſt cannot be proved from the Apocalypſe.

Thus much have I thought it neceſſary to ſay, rather hiſtorically than dogmatically concerning the doctrines delivered in the Apocalypſe, becauſe it is of importance to know, whether they contradict the other doctrines of the New Teſtament. I confeſs, that during this inquiry, my belief in the divine authority of the Apocalypſe has received no more confirmation than it had before: and I muſt leave the deciſion of this important queſtion to every man's private judgement.

FINIS.

Luke Hinſard, Printer,
Great Turnſtile, Lincoln's-Inn Fields.

00111096

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 03 December, 2015